4.15.31

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

PURCHASED BY THE HAMILL MISSIONARY FUND.

Division DS480

Section 45.07

MUST ENGLAND LOSE INDIA?

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 15 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MUST ENGLAND LOSE INDIA?

[THE NEMESIS OF EMPIRE]

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL
ARTHUR OSBURN D.S.O.

ALFRED A. KNOPF
LONDON & NEW YORK
MCMXXX

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
FOR ALFRED A. KNOPF INC.
BY BUTLER & TANNER LTD.
FROME SOMERSET

FIRST PUBLISHED MAY 1930
SECOND EDITION AUGUST 1930
THIRD EDITION DECEMBER 1930

PREFACE

*E*XTRACT *from a letter received by the Author from a pro-English American:*

'Even in America eighty per cent. of the whole of the National Revenue is now spent in paying for past wars or preparing for war in the future. Unless the mentality of the most important class in the world—your English governing class—be changed, then nothing can be changed, and the future for mankind is dark indeed—ruin waits for us all.'

What exactly does this American mean? What is there in our mentality that should be changed?

Not many years ago Mr. Lloyd George, speaking of the autocratic and short-sighted selfishness of our governing classes, denounced them as 'ten thousand little Czars.' It is supposed that there is less now of arrogance and class distinction, greater civility and gentleness, than there was fifty years ago—but is it actually true?

Only a year ago, at the General Election, Liberal and Socialist canvassers were implored to move away from the doorways of working-class folk, 'I'm going to vote for your candidate, sir—but if my Conservative landlord or employer were to see you here and your card in my window, we should be turned out into the streets, and my husband out of his job on the first excuse! ' If we can so mistrust, intimidate and unjustly treat one another on our own small island, are we not likely to behave still more tyrannically in repressing those whose opinions differ from our own in India?

In Mr. Sheriff's *Journey's End*, two young men, fresh from the same Public School, are facing death together. The senior, under the influence of alcohol —*In vino veritas*—calls his old school friend, who dare not retaliate, ' a bloody little swine '. This exhibition is provoked because the younger has shown some independence of judgment—has not joined in some—what he considers to be—untimely merry-making, but instead has dared to stay with his fellow-Englishmen who do not happen to be officers but are equally facing death for their country! There has been little or no criticism of this incident. In the England of 1930 it is apparently accepted as being true to life.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I THE ROAD WE HAVE TRAVELLED: A SURVEY OF THE PREDISPOSING FACTORS 1

II THE ATTITUDE OF THE ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA 20

III THE 'SCHOOL-BOY' SUPERIORITY-COMPLEX—AND ITS MANIFESTATION 48

IV PREJUDICE AND PRIDE; FEAR AND INDIFFERENCE 90
  1. Indian Morals and 'Mother India' 90
  2. Odium Theologium 95
  3. The Indian Disarmed 107
  4. The Stranger within the Indian Gates 116
  5. The Problem of India's Population 118
  6. Wine, Women . . . and Clubs 124
  7. Divide and Rule 130

V SEX AND SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS 133

VI A STIFF-NECKED GENERATION 166

VII THE LORDS OF MISRULE 191
  1. Becoming Humility 191
  2. Law and Order 193
  3. Opium and Prisons 205
  4. Hunger in the Making 208
  5. Punitive Police 216
  6. Politically Equal but Socially Incompatible? 219
  7. The Indian Millstone 221
  8. The Cult of Racialism and Exclusiveness 223

VIII 'ROUGH ISLANDERS' 235

IX THE PROHIBITIONISTS 245

X REMEDIES AND REFLECTIONS 251
  1. Remedies 251
  2. The Source of the Mischief? 267
  3. Our Stewardship—Has it been Just? 271

INDEX 277

CHAPTER ONE

THE ROAD WE HAVE TRAVELLED

MOTHER INDIA!—STEP-MOTHER ENGLAND!

Mother India—warm, untidy, sensual perhaps, and much too prolific. Too dreamy. Confused with her problems, but yet with all her failings a warm, brown-skinned mother.

Step-Mother England—the stern, cold, white-faced, censorious school-marm. Thin-lipped, self-righteous, exacting, misunderstanding—with a whip in her hand!

Always a threat upon her lips and a whip in her hand—scolding.

A shadow of glum disapproval that leans over Asia.

And always that whip!

This is how the Indian thinks and feels.

Which will the Indian choose?

§ 1

This book—at once a criticism, a confession, and an appeal—is written with but one motive: to suggest what are the true reasons for our growing difficulties in India, and, by drawing attention to the causes of the present discontent in that unhappy country and to certain possible remedies, to delay or prevent the demand in India for Independence or Home Rule from becoming irresistible.

There are some who say that even if we could now change our manners and outlook it is too late. The mischief has been done as it was done in America and Ireland and in South Africa, as it has been done in Egypt, in Burma and in China.

If this book had been published—as it could have been—twenty years ago, it might have prevented the insensate arrogance that led up to the massacre of Amritsar and all the other wretched episodes that have driven nails into the coffin of the British Empire in India and elsewhere. But twenty years ago it would not have been listened to, because we had not then had the lesson which at least some of us have learnt from the events of the Irish Rebellion and the European War and its pestilential aftermath. It takes an Amritsar and a Burning of Cork and the loss of a province to shake the upper middle-class Englishman out of his colossal conceit that he is a divinely-appointed Governor in perpetuity of about half the earth—if not the remainder—when he has had time to take it. But since His Majesty's advice was not listened to—it would be highly presumptuous to suppose that the criticisms of an obscure subaltern officer would have been heard.

There is absolutely nothing in this book that any Englishman who has travelled with his eyes and ears open in India could not have seen and found out for himself. The higher English officials in India are agreeable enough to their equals, and are nothing if not hospitable to other Englishmen of the same social position. The warmth of their hospitality is only equalled by the unrestrained vigour of their denunciation of the Indian in particular and of all liberal and democratic ideas of governance in general. Whether you are a bank clerk or a merchant or a doctor, you hear and see how things are in India very quickly. In the Garrison Clubs—of which civilians of good social standing are nearly always made honorary members—one hears of the real inside of the Indian machine. There is, of course, little to hide, for after all, in actual fact, we hold and govern India by might and not by right; and no official Englishman in India ever pretends to the contrary, however much may be *said* to the contrary by some official apologist in the House of Commons.

The political outlook of the Englishman in India is always at least twenty years behind that of the man in the same position in England. Unconsciously he has something of the same feeling for coloured people which may have been felt by his ancestors in feudal England for the village labourer.

The criticism in this book is also largely a confession—for the writer does not pretend that he behaved with any greater consideration to the Indian than the majority of his fellow-countrymen. Indians, he was told, only understand force; they do not appreciate civility or kindness. In his case, the same influences and up-bringing produced the same result. It is his generation that still hold sway and fill the higher posts on the Bench and in the Army and Public Services both in England and in India.

Sir Valentine Chirol's account of the ghastly massacre at Amritsar takes one back to the ' frightfulness ' of the days when, after the Indian Mutiny, Indian soldiers were lashed by the English to the muzzle of their cannon and blown to pieces. We English change but slowly; the Crawling Order and even the brutality of Podanur are evidence that the attitude of the average Englishman in India to the Indian remains much the same. Because an English missionary was ' insulted ' the inhabitants of one of the largest of the Indian cities were compelled by the British officers to crawl upon their bellies whenever they passed through the street where this had occurred. Not the perpetrators of the ' insult ' but old men, women and little children, absolutely innocent of any offence and entirely ignorant as to the reason of this monstrous indignity forced upon them in their own country. The Public School-boyishness of this amazing order is obvious. It is the ' Third Form Mind ' of a second-rate Public School monkeying with the pivot of our Trade, which is the ' goodwill ' of India and the Far East.

But mainly this book is an appeal, not to the English Nation as a whole, of whom the great bulk are neither Negro-phobe nor arrogant—but rather to the English governing classes to drop a little of their stupid arrogance and racial and caste snobbery, if only for the sake of that great heterogeneous

' Empire ' about which they are always shouting but which they are constantly doing their very best to make unpopular and consequently insecure.

Last but not least, this book is an appeal to any discontented Indian into whose hands it may fall not to become disheartened, sulky or desperate—to have still a little patience—if only because this book is itself some proof that there are English men and women who regret very much what we have done and are still doing in India; and who realize that by brutalizing and deliberalizing so many of our governing classes out there we are making a Revoution in England almost a certainty.

§ 2

This book was already in the press when the writer learnt of the difficulties which the Simon Commission were experiencing in obtaining the co-operation of the Indians. Unwilling that anything said in this book should irritate or excite either the Indian or the Die-hard element amongst the more reactionary English officials in India, and thus further add to the difficulties of the Commission, the writer withdrew the book, hoping that in the interval a more reasonable attitude might prevail on both sides. It is true that one of his oldest friends—a Member of the Commission—assured him that things were now so unsatisfactory in India that he did not think that anything that could be said or written could possibly make things any worse. Since then the Commission have returned to India for their second visit and apparently attempts have been made to blow up their train. It is probable that had this book not been withdrawn the less thoughtful would perhaps have tried to fix on its author part of the responsibility for this stupid and criminal act! As if the results of two generations of the arrogant display of a superiority-complex acquired very largely at our Public Schools could be saddled on the writer of a book who attempts to expose the origin of the complex, the damage it has already done in India and elsewhere, and the harm it is likely to do in the future.

The writer looks forward to a time when the United States of India will dwell contented within the orbit of the British Commonwealth. When all suggestion of dominance which the stupid boast of our ‘ Empire over India ’ awakes will be a thing of the past, and the Indian will be in fact, as well as in law, on perfect terms of economic, political and social equality with all the other citizens of the Commonwealth of which he will be an equal member. Domination in Ireland, India, Egypt or elsewhere—or even in an English village—breeds inevitably a sense of fear and hostility—a state of tension; an atmosphere is present in which suspicion and the cruelty born of the fear which the suspicions engender can naturally flourish.

There is no record in history of one comparatively small country—such as England—being able to keep in perpetual subjection a vast territory such as India where nearly one quarter of the whole human race have established their own culture and lived and laboured for untold centuries. Even if it were possible to perpetuate such a condition, it is doubtful whether the bulk of the electors in England would consent to have it so. Instinctively they would feel that domination practised abroad might come home to roost. So India, if she is to stay, must stay as a voluntary guest in the Mansion of the Commonwealth, as a brother or a cousin who may be very different in appearance, in habits, in philosophy and even in morals; as an ally and not as a kind of child-prisoner immured by force within the walls of a giant reformatory school.

We pretend before the League of Nations that India is an equal and a willing and satisfied Member of the British Commonwealth—but the Continental newspapers publish news about India which does not always appear in English journals. The pretence deceives no one and only helps to weaken further our own prestige as well as the prestige of the League of Nations.

Apologists for our present system of governing India will sometimes draw attention to the fact that India during the last hundred and fifty years—the period of our rule in India—has progressed. But is there any other part of the world that has absolutely stood still during that period? Have not many other parts of Asia such as Afghanistan, Persia, Siam and Japan progressed even much more decidedly outside our rule than India has within it? Vast countries such as China and Brazil and the other huge South American States have in many instances and respects made far more progress than has India. French observers, especially those romantically inclined, think that our rule in India has had at least one good result—it has delayed the disappearance of the romantic past. The Indian—they explain—disliking the English coldness and arrogance, has by association of ideas come to dislike all European ideas and institutions and has therefore clung far more desperately to his traditions—good, bad or indifferent as they may be—than he would otherwise have done. It is worth noting that in Ireland—almost before the ashes of their successful Rebellion were cold—the Irish set on foot large schemes of development and reconstruction which were never heard of while they were ‘ garrisoned ’ by British troops and largely controlled by an English government in London.

In dealing with the problem of Indian discontent and the disastrous effects on the solidarity of our Empire of the attitude of mind which characterizes our governing classes, and in discussing also the abuse of their powers by the police in India, there would have been in the ordinary way no necessity to touch on the difficult and controversial subject of sex. The introduction of this subject is only too likely to confuse the issues. But, unfortunately, an American writer whose books have had a large circulation, has half persuaded the world that India's troubles are not due to the aridity of her soil or the stupidity of her governors, nor the high birth-rate and the backward state of hygiene, but rather that the Indian is degenerate, under-sized, miserable and incompetent, because of his lascivious conduct and his ' youthful depravity '.

Now sex is ' a best seller ', and because it is so an audience that might never have been interested in India have now become interested, and it is impossible at the moment to deal with any Indian problem, or to make any criticism of that want of ' sympathy ' which King George commented on twenty years ago, which is shown by our official classes for Indian difficulties and aspirations, without being bombarded with statements from Miss Mayo's books, and with questions which concern the reactions of sex on social and economic problems, as well as upon the minds of Governors brought up in a moral atmosphere which, though it may not be really any better, is yet very different.

The writer will therefore be obliged to refer constantly to sex-matters, and to the causes, manifestations, and results of what is usually spoken of as ' depravity '. Depravity naturally includes almost any form of indulgence which the person using the word does not indulge in himself—or at least, does not admit he is inclined to—whether it include gambling, drink, gluttony, sloth, fornication, or drug-taking. Now the danger is, that if one skims gracefully over these matters, there is a certainty that what is said will be either seriously misunderstood, or grossly misrepresented by sentimentalists in a hurry, and by opponents who are in want of an argument, or whose pet prejudices—political or moral—have been stepped upon. On the other hand, if the causes and results are carefully scrutinized, there is the danger that prudery will consider what is written unpleasant and demoralizing, even if it be true; or that explanations of phenomena will be misrepresented as a defence of the conduct which is being explained. Moreover, such is the prevailing ignorance and the sentimental resistance to the spread of more rational ideas concerning sex questions, that what cannot be contradicted will be called sophistry, and what cannot, on account of systematic research, be proved in black and white to be always the case, will be dismissed as mere theorizing.

Brought up in a Puritan atmosphere of almost ‘ quarter-deck ’ simplicity, the writer has neither by habit nor inclination much use for voluptuaries in general, nor any special attraction—though he sympathizes with them—for the Indians, their culture, religious philosophy, and, to him, somewhat peculiar habits. He can discern, nevertheless, that the world at present is in far more danger from ruthless war and short-sighted greed, than from excess of affection or that sensuous sentimentality that so often may lead to indolence or sensuality.

Sensuality in any form, he considers, neither deserves nor requires any defence. There can be no question that any excessive indulgence must either weaken the mind or the body. Unfortunately, what may appear ruinous ‘ excess ’ to him, evidently appears to be but moderate indulgence to other folk. The Indian’s religion contains precepts against ‘ excess ’; but as in Europe, so in India, the good advice is commonly not attended to. Unconsciously, perhaps, we Anglo-Saxons would draw our own and the World’s attention from greed and violence and cruelty in all their forms, to focus it upon certain vices we are least inclined to, and so most disapprove of, such as sloth, extravagance, sex indulgence, drugs or alcohol.

In *Mother India* and *The Slaves of the Gods*, great stress is laid on the misery, poverty, degradation, lack of sanitation and general backwardness of India. Much is said concerning the want of education and sexual immorality. Oddly enough it appears that English officials in India gave the American author every opportunity for collecting statistics of vice, crime, indecency, unnatural offences and other forms of immorality. This side of the subject is written up in a lurid and somewhat exaggerated fashion. Naturally such a book would sell like hot cakes in the United States, and naturally—surely the English officials must have thought of this—the book provokes the reflection in America that if this is the state of India after the English have been there for one hundred and eighty years it is high time that we left India! One did not realize that officials in India were so anxious to curtail the duration of our control there! At least this American author will have compelled us to treble or quadruple the amount spent on education and sanitation in India and proportionately reduce the amount we spend on the Indian Army and its allied services. This may not be a bad thing.

The writing-up of sexual immorality in such a way is surely a form of Exhibitionism that is becoming increasingly common, especially in countries such as America and England where a good deal of Puritanical espionage on sex indulgence is practised. A sensational account of vice and immorality—real or exaggerated—is highly delectable, especially to those who have little opportunity, but a good deal of inclination, to practise some of these indulgences: it provides a form of ' vicarious enjoyment '. It does, in fact, correspond to a lurid cinematograph film unrolled before the eyes of those who pretend, while they gloat on the details, that the whole thing has really a moral purpose. The result is, of course, the very opposite. If already a quarter of the world's population all indulge in unmentionable practices, then why should not some of the others in the United States or elsewhere? Actions that are already so common may surely be made still commoner without great harm? People will think this if they do not say it! The writer believes that these two books, however much they may or may not discredit British rule in India, will do harm and further convince the Indian that we are prejudiced.

But if any reader of these two books imagines that he will easily find in India anything to surpass the vice and sexual immorality in his or her own country, he will almost certainly be disappointed. The writer worked as a doctor in India and, while of misery and poverty and disease and hopelessness there was a superabundance, the immorality, *considering the gigantic population and its ignorance and want of education,* was not striking. One would expect that under a tropical sun with so much over-crowding, poverty, and a much earlier sex-maturity and a much shorter expectation of life, there would be a very great deal of sexual immorality, especially as the vast majority of the population are so poor that they cannot possibly afford any other form of enjoyment or excitement except that which is gratuitously provided by the sex-appetite. For a well-fed American or Englishman who can afford at least a dozen other forms of indulgence and excitement to rebuke some poverty-stricken fellow-being for being sexually indulgent or ' immoral ' is surely a rather gratuitous piece of inconsequence and stupidity.

The Indian will become more sexually continent as he becomes less poverty-stricken and his hold on life becomes less precarious. When life is precarious, sex-morals and a good many other things go to the wall, as even we Englishmen found when we were in the trenches. If you do not expect to live long and know that in any case your life will be miserable—why on earth bother much about some other nation thinking you respectable? Much immorality existing in India is but Misery's effort at birth-control—an instinctive waste of seed that ought never to be sown in such impoverished fields.

In any case, we can be certain that the ' moralities ' and the ' immoralities ' of the Indian beneath his tropical sun will never be exactly the same as those of the Anglo-Saxon races—why should they be?

It is very hard when dealing with a huge territory such as India or China, the United States of America or Russia, to form any sound opinion on general morals from statistics which deal only with vice and crime. The population of India is as large or larger than the whole of Europe. Suppose all the vice, immorality and crime that occur between Constantinople and Killarney, Lapland and the Straits of Gibraltar, were focused together, what an appalling impression of European wickedness would be conveyed to an assembly in a Hindu Temple. Yet the audience in an English church or in the House of Commons listens with a sense of complacent superiority to the figures of crime and immorality collected between Rangoon and Karachi, Colombo and Simla, without having the faintest idea as to what the comparative figures would be if that huge tropical area were occupied not by Hindus, but by a mixed bag of 300 million poverty-stricken Greeks, Spaniards, Belgians, French and Welshmen!

The poverty of India is incontestable, the immorality of the Indian as compared with equal numbers of other races under similar conditions is difficult either to prove or to disprove—this makes it a delightfully easy and profitable subject for an American woman to write about. This good lady's statement that many of the Temple dancing girls in India are immoral, is actually at the moment being used as a proof that the Indians are unfit to have Dominion Home Rule! If that were the sole reason against their claim to Home Rule or independence they would have a stronger case than even their most hot-headed friends imagine. Surely whether these Temple maidens—or Devadasis, as they are called—are or are not immoral matters not at all. The sexual indiscretions of the Indian and his customs and religious philosophy are surely his own affair.

Because in this book the writer criticizes the spirit of his class he feels he must add a word of explanation, lest it be thought that he has some old scores to pay off—some axe to grind—some feeling of thwarted ambition to expose.

No sense of unrequited merit embitters his memory. He liked those he served with and was happy in his work. He has no personal enmity against his own social grade in England.

During the last twenty-five or thirty years it has been his privilege to serve with soldiers and sailors, both as an officer and as a private, with cavalry and with infantry, as a regular and as a volunteer, combatant and non-combatant, by sea and land, at home and abroad, in peace and in war. Some of those he loved best died in his arms during the South African War and in the last great struggle in Europe. Others left the service of their country bitter, disillusioned and heartbroken by the squalid and lying propaganda, the tragic blunders, the shameless brutalities and the humiliating episodes of the Boer War, the Great War and the miserable Irish ‘ Rebellion ’.

It so happened that the writer was interested in his work and ‘ all out ’, as far as his individual efforts could help, to make any unit he served in efficient—there was no merit in this—it was temperamental rather than moral. But he received a more than full meed of thanks for doing a simple duty for which he was well paid, obtained more success than he hoped for, more honour than he feels he deserved.

Now he can but fight for those dusky-skinned fellow-citizens of the Commonwealth who are so feeble, so much less fortunate than he, whose ill-paid labour enriches himself and his class, and in doing so feels it may not—in the end—be the least of his services to King and Country.

§ 3

Personalities do not affect principles, abuse is not argument.

Being anxious to avoid raising any personal issues the writer has purposely refrained from mentioning any incident that has occurred very recently in India.

The point of view put forward may appear belated because there have recently been Administrative Reforms in India, which incidentally have only increased the irritability of the white man with the Indian. Lest any reader should imagine that incidents similar to those described are not taking place at this very moment in India, an extract of a letter just received from a trustworthy, conscientious and pro-English source is given.

Extract from a letter received in 1928, from the relative of a Commanding Officer living with him in India.

'. . . I rather hate the bullying that goes on out here. . . . I don't think we ought to have a lower standard of conduct for ourselves out here than we have at home. It's all I can do not to break out sometimes when I hear people say things and do things they wouldn't dream of doing in England. It's all very well making the excuse that "this is India and not England". Surely we are out here rightly or wrongly to Europeanize the Indians not to Indianize ourselves. And there are such rotten outsiders in the Indian and British Armies now who take their tone from one or two Senior Officers such as our General—a charming old man in private life—and are only too glad to be able to bully servants and coolies who cannot retaliate. . . .'

Unconsciously an English official and his wife who have just landed from India confirm the doubts about the 'improvement' there. 'Jack', says the wife in husband's hearing, 'is really unusually gentle with his Indian work-people, he hardly ever thrashes them except when he thinks they are being intentionally slack'—a question—and she answers so innocently—'Oh, no! of course they wouldn't dare to hit him back.' This suggests that hitting people who daren't hit you back used to be considered cowardly. 'Oh, well—it's different in India, you know. I suppose', she adds reflectively, 'if they did hit us back we shouldn't hit them.'

The House of Commons is told that the Government of India has issued orders against the bullying of natives; but if the senior officers responsible for seeing these orders obeyed in letter and spirit are themselves a bad example to their juniors, the orders are not likely to do much good.

An interesting commentary on the foregoing letter is contained in a recent letter written by a Hindu student of philosophy to friends in America. In this letter he states that on arrival in England he was astonished to find how polite the Englishman in England is to Indians, as compared with the treatment all Indians have become accustomed to receive from Englishmen in India. For the first time in his life he found he was not looked at in scorn, or spoken to and treated as if he were either a naughty child or a refractory dog. He was in fact so astonished that he wrote to say he could almost suppose these people must be an entirely different race to the Englishmen he had come up against in India!

It must be insisted that the Government of India is trying now to curb the arrogance of the Negrophobe. But there is this difficulty, that its own personnel have themselves acquired at school a class-conscious habit and an exaggerated racial prejudice —a fixed belief that they, above all others, possess ‘ the gift of governing ’. Those whom the Indian Government would restrain are arriving, filled with contempt for the Indian because they have greedily believed Miss Mayo’s wholesale accusations.

The writer is aware that there are some Public Schools who no longer permit brutality and torture disguised under the name of ‘ discipline and corporal punishment'. But, none the less, the effect of segregation and its implied superiority will be still to create class-conscious prigs—so ignorant of the misery and depravity that exist in their own country and in Europe, and accordingly, so unreasonably contemptuous and harsh in their judgment of the Indian.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ATTITUDE OF THE ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA

§ 1

MUST England lose India? As things are going now it looks as if we shall, and in the not distant future.

It is not long since the stock description of the Hindu race was that of a meek, docile and easily governed people.

Doubtless there were always races and tribes within the borders of India who were warlike and turbulent, yet the great bulk of the inhabitants of the Indian Peninsula were not only gentle and easy-going, but submissive; easily governed and exploited by a mere handful of Englishmen. How is it that in the last thirty or forty years these characteristics have so changed? What has caused such a fierce and persistent Nationalism to arise? What has caused this intense widespread unrest and opposition to our Rule and these reiterated demands for self-government? Demands backed up by boycotts strikes, riots, the throwing of bombs, and any and every form of violent disorder that, until lately, were so distasteful to the gentle Hindu.

This intense Nationalism, which makes thousands of Hindus in good social position ready to face the torture and miseries of Indian prisons, to risk death, almost to clamour for martyrdom, if thereby they may free India from its ' Alien Oppressors ', is, comparatively speaking, a quite recent phenomenon.

§ 2

It is essential that Englishmen should realize the causes that have stimulated this demand for Swaraj (Home Rule), and this hatred of the British Government of India. It is idle to suppose it is mere ' cussedness ' or the work of ' foreign ' agitators.

The writer has realized that these demands, and this change of spirit need never have arisen, but for the arrogance and want of tact of a large percentage of Englishmen, who, in one capacity or another, are resident in India.

From what he himself saw, there can be no possible doubt that the personal hostility of the average Indian to-day to the Englishman and the English Government is simply a defensive reaction against the overbearing arrogance and open contempt which nearly all Englishmen working in India display towards the Indians of all classes.

The term ' Englishman ' in these pages includes other Europeans ; because the vast majority of the Europeans in India come from the British Isles. There can be no doubt, however, that non-British Europeans working in India are, generally speaking, less openly insulting to the Indians, being of course less sure of the support of the Indian Government than an Englishman, especially an official, can usually be. It is said that in many of the regrettable incidents with natives in India and elsewhere in recent years, men of Irish rather than English extraction have figured prominently. In fairness to the Irish it must be pointed out that the percentage of Irishmen in the Indian Civil Service as well as in the commissioned ranks of the Indian and British Armies was and still is disproportionately high.

On this point the writer, being English, does not care to venture an opinion. Possibly men of Irish extraction are inclined to be less patient, more overbearing and quarrelsome, and more ready to administer thrashings than Englishmen. In any case one may say disputes between Europeans and Natives, which usually finish up with the Native receiving much coarse abuse or a ‘ good hiding ’, are of daily occurrence in practically every part of India in which Europeans are resident.

But English people in England will naturally ask why, if an Englishman, or for that matter an Irishman, usually behaves with a fair degree of self-restraint and civility at home, he should so often behave so very differently when dealing with the coloured races in India and elsewhere.

The reasons are not far to seek.

First of all it has to be remembered that the majority of Englishmen whose circumstances compel them to leave England for work in India leave their native country reluctantly. They are told on every side that the climate is unhealthy, which is more or less true; and that generally speaking, it is not a white man's country, which is even truer. White women of a marriageable age are comparatively scarce in India, and a young man knows that he is leaving behind him not only his friends, relations, and English interests, but also some at least of his chances of selecting a wife from the much wider field open to him in England.

Englishmen by no means well off will offer anything from £50 to £1,500 to obtain a substitute and so avoid serving in India.

For married men with families the reasons for resenting service in India are even stronger. The attractions of a higher rate of pay, sport and big game shooting, cannot possibly compensate for separation from their children, the burden of the Indian climate, the monotonous and poverty-stricken surroundings, and the feeling of exile.

The average Englishman goes out to India more often because he must, than because he wants to; and it is natural that he should give vent to his feeling of resentment by irritability, and an inclination, not always resisted, to kick an Indian whenever he sees one.

There are many other reasons why an Englishman is apt to appear unreasonably irritable in India. Not only is the heat trying and likely to cause irritating gastric and bowel complaints; but the intense actinic rays of the sun are highly irritating to the nervous system of many white people. Much of the food is unappetizing and unnourishing. The precautions that have to be constantly taken against malaria and many other serious endemic diseases such as plague, typhoid, dysentery and cholera are irritating. The dust, flies, mosquitoes and other insects are even more irritating. The native servants —such of them as are willing to work for the ' mad and unaccountably rough Englishmen '—are for the most part forgetful, generally irritating, and rather inefficient.

The majority of the Indians, rotten with malaria and other tropical diseases, or half-starved, are naturally from these causes slow, forgetful and unreliable. They are weak and undersized, and given to whining and prevarication. In fact the robust and impatient Englishman is apt to find a fresh cause for an outburst of temper at every turn; and in such a country there is very little incentive to control his temper—a virtue he does not cheerfully practise even in his own country.

Now an Englishman in England who struck one of his servants or a railway porter who made some mistake about his luggage would almost certainly find the blow returned with interest. In India should a Native return even feebly a blow struck by an Englishman he would be at once labelled as 'truculent and seditious'. Anyone, even a Cabinet Minister, who behaved with arrogance and violence in England would almost certainly find himself being escorted to a police-station followed by a jeering mob; the bystanders or his other servants would almost certainly take the side of the man he had struck; and the Press and public opinion would hold his arrogant want of self-control up to ridicule. Should it turn out that the order which his servant or the porter disobeyed had been given in an unintelligible jargon, and that the man who had been struck was much smaller and weaker, the aggressor would certainly be held up to public contempt as a coward, a bully and an arrogant cad.

In short the bully that is more or less latent in all of us is kept severely in check in England by our fellow Englishman's fist, the police, the Press, and public opinion.

But unfortunately in India and the East generally, for one reason or another, these deterrents are not in operation. Most Indians, especially the servants and coolies, are, compared to an average Englishman, small, weak and underfed—probably they average two or three stone less in weight. And should they dare, in spite of this, to return a blow, however undeserved, they would not only get a good thrashing from the Englishman himself, but would be liable to get into the bad books of the police, who would consider that this attempt to return a blow given by an English 'Sahib' showed a 'seditious' tendency.

Now for the Indian to get into the bad books of the Indian police whose senior officials are nearly all Englishmen, is a far more serious and troublesome matter than for an Englishman to be regarded as 'troublesome' by his own police authorities in England. In addition, neither the Law, nor the Press, nor Anglo-Indian public opinion in India would be inclined to sanction, whatever the circumstances, a mere ‘ native ’ striking a white man; especially a white man who was a ‘ real Sahib ’, i.e. in a good position, and particularly if he were an official.

Any poorer class Indian who hoped to get an English Sahib adequately punished for having struck him, would find not only that it was a costly experiment far above his means, but that the judges and all English officials would listen very sympathetically to the Englishman’s claim that he had received some kind of ‘ provocation ’, that the native had been ‘ cheeky ’, or insulted the English ‘ uniform ’, or something of the sort. As so many Englishmen in India hold some kind of official position, and uniform is more worn than in England, even when the wearer is not on duty, this provocation is a fairly easy thing to prove—at least for the majority of those for whose opinion the Englishman cares.

Even supposing no actual blow is struck, but only insults thrown at the servant or some other Indian by the irritable Sahib—and it is extraordinary to what depths of obscenity and insult Englishmen of all classes can descend when they are irritated with a ‘ mere native ’—the Englishman would be infuriated, and the police and magistrates scandalized, were the native so insulted to attempt to give back anything like the same insulting and obscene epithets.

To put it briefly, the Indian, whatever we may pretend, is considered and treated as an inferior race; and an Englishman’s word in India is bound as a general rule to be taken against an Indian’s. It is fairly safe then for an Englishman to treat an Indian as he likes, provided it is not done before Indian witnesses; although even then the chances are in favour of the Sahib.

Naturally if one is English one is not anxious to go into court to support an Indian's case against a fellow Englishman, unless the brutality of the circumstance is very exceptional; to offer even to agree to give such evidence, would be to court immediate ostracism in the Club, on the tennis court and polo ground, and everywhere where one meets one's fellow Englishmen. A Sahib's dependence on the society of his fellow Englishmen is absolute. ' Coventry ' in India would be impossible and unbearable, his career would be ruined.

Even Indian witnesses, including police, realizing that so many influential and senior officers of the police are Englishmen, are by no means anxious to risk unpopularity by giving evidence likely to be unpalatable to the official Englishman, because it inculpates some other Sahib likely to be his friend or a colleague or at least an acquaintance.

Also there is a hard economic reason why the native should submit to a good deal of abuse and harsh treatment from members of the Ruling Race. Employment in India is difficult to obtain, there is practically no Poor Law system by which those dismissed from employment because they resent rough treatment can avoid the risk of starvation. In a country where famine or scarcity is frequent, and death from starvation by no means uncommon, resentment at an employer's unreason, harshness, or even actual brutality, has to be kept at a minimum.

§ 3

Quite apart from the causes mentioned above which make an Englishman in India prone to be irritable and ill-controlled, there is another factor even more obstinate. Not only has the native Indian failings due largely to his climate and circumstances, but he has also certain physical and mental characteristics which make him displeasing to certain white people. Even when he is cleanly, his skin has an odour different to the characteristic body smell of a clean and well-fed member of the white races. Many English people have an intense repugnance to this odour.

Even in England perfect cleanliness of the body and underclothing costs a considerable sum—probably few well-to-do people realize how much they spend in this way. Such expenditure or even anything like it is utterly beyond the reach of the vast majority of the poverty-stricken inhabitants of India, where dust is so plentiful and profuse sweating a matter of daily necessity. When to this is added the fact that the Indian's food is often coarse, greasy, or rancid, it will be understood that he may easily be physically very offensive to the more fastidious of the English in India. The Indian's 'under' clothing is seen because he wears usually nothing over it as we do; if he is grubby it is not concealed under dark coverings as in Europe.

Moreover the ways of the Indian are not our ways, and most decidedly our ways are not his ways. His manners repel us almost as much as our pig-eating and cow-eating repel him.

To many Englishmen and to most English women the mere sight of a coolie or poor class Indian is almost an offence. His soiled and scanty clothing, his lean and cringing figure, his whining voice and apparently unintelligent gestures, make him an unattractive figure. Somehow to the Englishman India seems to be mainly peopled either with these unattractive coolies, or else with rather bumptious, incompetent, and argumentative Indian clerks, or 'Babus' as they are called.

Englishmen see more of these two classes than any other, except the servant class. As only the lowest and most poverty-stricken class will consent to act as servants for the rough-handed, abusive and rather fearsome pig-eating English Sahib, he naturally forms a very bad and, generally speaking, erroneous opinion of the Indian.

It happens also that, excluding private soldiers, the vast majority of Englishmen and women who go to India are drawn from the well-to-do classes, and are for the most part amazingly ignorant of the slum conditions that exist in most of the great towns in England. What can the English boy or girl who has been brought up in a neat villa in some select English suburb, and put to school at Cheltenham, Dulwich or Charterhouse, possibly know of the degradation, the drink, the vermin, the over-crowding, the cruelty, the incest and even the bestiality that may and often do exist within a few thousand yards or a few miles of their home in England? As a rule they know nothing; and not being given to spending their time in the poorer parts of our big cities, or in reading Home Office statistics, are never likely to learn that the degraded misery at which they turn up their noses in India, exists amongst their own people in England.

It is safe to say that there is no cruelty, degradation, or vice existing in India which could not be matched by equally abominable things in at least fifty of the larger cities in England and on the European continent.

§ 4

It is well to bear in mind when considering the resentment Indians feel for the manners of Europeans towards them, that it is harder for them to put up with abuse, contempt, or ill-treatment from an alien than from their own kith and kin. Differences of race and culture there are between the various races of India, just as there are between the various nations of Europe; but an Englishman would certainly feel less insulted at a sneer or a blow from a Dane or a Frenchman than he would from a Chinaman, an

Indian, or a native of Japan. In a similar way, injustice, abuse or even blows from anyone of his own blood and colour are more tolerable to any Indian than the supercilious and icy disdain of young Mr. Snooks, of Dulwich and the Indian Civil Service; or the more bombastic dislike of Lieutenant Smith, of Charterhouse and the Indian Army.

§ 5

On our trade with India and on the immense tribute which she pays to us in the form of salaries and pensions, depends the prosperity of many of our industries and institutions. There are Public Schools and important firms, whose clientèle consist very largely of persons directly or indirectly dependent on remittances from India.

The question we have to ask ourselves is whether it is worth risking all we make, directly or indirectly, out of India, merely in order that a small number of Englishmen may be allowed to display unchecked their superiority-complex in India, and thereby gradually destroy our position in that country.

The old East India Company had the power, which it did not fail to use, of expelling from India any European whose exasperating attitude to the native was such as to render English Rule unpopular.

Why has not the Indian Government the same powers, and if it has, why does it not put them to the same use? It expels ' Agitators ' but not Negro-phobes!

It is not an uncommon thing to hear in India officers in the British Army and even the English officers of the Indian Army, Indian police, Indian civilians, and English business men, declare that they ' loathe the very sight of a native '. They make no secret of this sentiment even though Indians may be within hearing!

These Negro-phobes should be cleared out of India. They do no good there. They make mutiny and insurrection and perhaps Independence inevitable. If they remain they are but fresh nails in the coffin of the British Empire in India.

The fact that this racial antagonism, this personal dislike is often perfectly genuine, does not make it any the less intolerable to the Indian and dangerous to our Empire.

Young Englishmen seem to be pretty generally agreed that on their arrival in India it is the abuse showered on the ' natives ' by their crusted seniors, that first turns them into nigger-haters. The bully that is latent in even the best of us appears, after long residence in India, to get complete possession of the rather liverish and depressed Englishmen who have reached the top, or nearly the top, of their respective professions.

One meets these ' nigger-haters ' everywhere, from Shanghai to Delhi; from Rangoon to the Service Clubs in Pall Mall. They are usually quite intelligent and even influential men, but imbued with the point of view which Mr. Kipling so eloquently voiced. They believe themselves to be a kind of Anglican Almighty who as far as ' natives ' are concerned, ' can do no wrong '.

Quite genially over a whisky-and-soda the returned Indian officer, Indian official, or business man, will describe the Hindus as ' stinking niggers ', ' seditious swine ', or by some other happily chosen obscene equivalent in Hindustani. They are the ' lesser breeds without the Law ', apparently outside both Habeas Corpus and the Sermon on the Mount!

In England this language and attitude may not do much harm. In India, with Hindus waiting at the table who are not entirely ignorant of English, it does almost incredible mischief. How can any race be expected to be anything but thoroughly disloyal to governors who they know despise and hate them?

§ 6

The West African negro is in philosophy and culture many thousands of years behind the Hindu; yet it is illegal on the West Coast of Africa to call a negro a ' nigger '. Why are we so much more susceptible to the feelings of the negro than to those of the Hindu? Can it be because the negro attends a missionary chapel; or is it because he is at least two stone heavier and is frequently inclined to hit back? If this is not the reason, what is it? It may be added that while an Englishman may treat a Bengali with contempt, his contempt for the fierce and lusty but slovenly Pathan who is often far more ‘ cheeky ’ to an Englishman than a Bengali would ever dare to be, is more carefully concealed. Is not this attitude rather opposed to our English tradition regarding the courage and conduct of an English gentleman?

Can it be that our Public School tradition that only little boys can be thrashed for being ‘ cheeky ’, but that stronger and bigger boys are best left alone, has anything to do with our rather cowardly differentiation between the Bengali on the one hand, and the Pathan and the negro on the other? In any case, it is far more dangerous to a young man’s popularity amongst his fellow Englishmen to risk the suspicion of being a ‘ pro-native ’ by being reasonably civil to Hindus, than it would be if he got into trouble for some really outrageous act of ill-temper or injustice towards one of his Indian servants, or some other Indian.

§ 7

The Englishman’s attitude to the native Indian has its inevitable reaction. As he grows more impatient and ill-tempered, the Hindus about him grow more sullen and resentful; less inclined to admit their faults or even to tell the truth to such a master.

Inevitably their untruthfulness provokes fresh contempt, and the contempt fresh resentment; a vicious circle indeed; it will require a Viceroy stronger even than the late Lord Curzon to break it.

In these troubled waters, amidst all this latent hostility between rulers and the ruled, the police force of India finds no doubt some danger, but also abundant profit and prestige. Obviously, the more discontented and 'seditious' the Indian populace becomes, the more important become the police and their British officers; and necessarily the greater must become their powers and the higher their pay and privileges.

In this connection one has to remember that in the mind of the average British official in India, to be discontented, even with a fairly obvious injustice, is to be 'seditious'; a very convenient confusion of ideas when their own carelessness or slackness has been brought to light, or when some panic-ridden General has ordered his troops to fire on a mob armed only with sticks and loin-cloths.

It thus comes about that the native police of India *hold the key position to British rule in that subcontinent.*

Were the police to side with the native populace British rule in India would vanish in a week, for the police are numbered by the hundred thousand; many have been trained in the use of arms, some are actually armed, and their defection would probably be followed by many of the regiments of the Native Army.

So it comes to this: owing to our want of sympathy and ordinary civility to the natives, the British Government in India is, politically speaking, almost *at the mercy of the native police force!*

From this point onwards the British Government in India is presented with a series of temptations to which it would be superhuman if it did not often succumb. The authorities at Simla are strongly tempted to do what they can to keep the police force and the general populace apart or in a condition of mutual distrust. Every reason of policy must induce them to ' support ' the police, even to the extent of condoning or appearing to condone or ignore police acts of injustice, oppression, excess of zeal and perhaps of torture or actual crime. They must too, in order to keep in with the rulers of the Native Indian States—whose assistance they may need in rounding up ' agitators ' who may have escaped from British India—connive to a greater or less degree at mis-government or oppression in those States. Should this mis-government provoke a rising against a harsh, unscrupulous or incompetent ruler, the British Government must generally support that ruler with troops and police and with Secret Service agents sent in from British India; for a revolt in a Native State might so easily, under the present unhappy circumstances, spread into the adjoining territory administered by ourselves.

Thus, because of the general hostility we have provoked by our ill-manners, we are beset on every side with serious temptation to employ Machiavellian policy—indeed, as things are we are practically compelled by the awkward position we are in to do so.

Were the police to be on really friendly terms with the people they might so easily sympathize with their grievances and then our position would indeed become precarious.

Shortly after the war the Hindus and Mohammedans in India were, generally speaking, on friendly terms. The adversities and injustices and the forced conscriptions and arbitrary acts of British officials had made them bedfellows. Then a great English Conservative newspaper that represents the opinions of many of the more influential of the ruling classes in England, declared in a leading article that this friendship between Hindu and Mohammedan was ' ominous '! Ominous suggests something to be feared! To be discouraged! ' Ay, do you fear it—then must we think you would not have it so! ' And when we would not have things so in India, we have *agents provocateurs* and a secret service and many other efficient means for preventing that union which this great newspaper considered to be ' ominous '. It is not an unfair assumption to think that we are not anxious to see the Mohammedans and Hindus in India united in friendly co-operation—they might after co-operation decide to drive us out! Why does a newspaper that considers friendship between the two religions to be ' ominous ' so indignantly deny that an Englishman or our Secret Service may sometimes have something to do with their quarrels or that the policy of the Indian Government may be to keep the ' Protestants and Catholics ' of India—as in Ireland—in separate camps?

In many parts of India the Indian Government, because it is not only alien, but also unpopular and despotic, dare not employ police drawn from the same district to maintain order. Indians of different caste and with different religion and racial characteristics, even those with hereditary feuds, must be drawn from one district of India to police another! It is as if an unpopular German invader of Scotland were to police the villages of the Clan Macdonald largely with the hated Campbells; or perhaps a closer analogy would be for a Chinese conqueror of Europe to police Paris with Prussians, Plymouth with Sicilian Carbonari, Rome with Calvinist Highlanders or Athens with Turkish Bashi-Bazouks.

As an individual who has a complaint against a policeman in India for, shall we say, robbery or rape —and such complaints are by no means uncommon —has only got the police to complain to, it does not need much imagination to realize what injustice is being perpetuated daily in India under the pretence of maintaining order and the British Raj. And this injustice is perpetrated by men in uniform with King George's cypher on their buttons and supported by British bayonets! And yet we are surprised that there is violent discontent and hatred of British rule in India!

In India, as in Ireland, the pretence that an alien rule can control or mitigate the hatred of Protestant for Catholic, Mohammedan for Hindu is sheer humbug. As a matter of fact, in both countries the alien ruler, unintentionally perhaps, by alternately favouring one side and then the other, only fans religious hatred and jealousy and dissension to a whiter heat; tactically speaking, it obviously pays him to do so—Divide and Rule!

The Indian Penal Code is of a strictness that would not be tolerated in any European country. The half-clad natives of Lahore submit to English-made police restrictions that would drive a suburb of London into revolt. Magna Carta and Habeas Corpus do not exist in India. The powers of the Government and its police are gigantic and irresistible. In the past a too despotic or extravagant rajah was easily poisoned or knifed, if he had only one real enemy; but you cannot stab to death all at once five thousand alien bureaucrats.

With a code so strict, a population so ignorant and helpless, and a police force so corrupt, the opportunities for blackmail of every kind are of course prodigious. In the country districts it is not uncommon to see Indian policemen helping themselves liberally from a villager's scanty load of vegetables without a word of protest. The very efficiency of English Government in India makes the police tyranny all the more unbearable, for in any loosely governed country an insurrection would wipe out the offending police.

There are regulations created by Englishmen by which an Indian Hindu's name can be placed on a register of bad characters (budnam), without any evidence except that of a Mohammedan policeman, who may, and often does, covet the delinquent's wife, his crop, or his merchandise. To be 'budnamed' in India is to be ruined, for it establishes a presumption of guilt in any future police court proceedings; and with all this it must be remembered that any Indian may be thrown into prison and remain there indefinitely without trial, and even without being informed of what he is *accused*! Even a Labour Government, to everyone's amazement, permitted this unjust and iniquitous practice.

If the behaviour of the ordinary police is admitted by their own officers to be often outrageous, the behaviour of the punitive police, quartered on villages considered to be ' politically troublesome or criminal ', is not likely, to put it mildly, to be any better; indeed, the worse it is the greater the efficacy of the ' punishment '—there is a sort of Black and Tan simplicity about this method of subduing those whose politics or morals we do not approve of. Surely this is not government but mis-government. How eloquent and indignant the London newspapers can grow when Turkish ' police ' are reported to have indulged in these tactics when quartered on an Armenian village when these were ' troublesome ' to the Turkish Imperial Authorities.

If we are by no means sure that the police are incorruptible and the judges impartial in England, why should we pretend they are so in India, where the public are even more at the mercy of the powers that be? It is axiomatic that the stringency of a law should be in inverse ratio to the lack of probity of those who enforce it. Given corruptible police and biassed judges who are, after all, in India but English officials—prejudiced foreigners from another world—then the more stringent the laws the greater the amount of injustice to be expected. The first essential is not so much a strict code of laws but an absolutely honest body of police. The injustice of one individual to another does harm, but the harm it does is almost negligible compared with the harm that is done by one single act of oppression, barbarity or injustice by the agents of the law. Such acts produce in those who suffer, a vehement and venomous anti-social reaction which nothing can assuage. We must and can forgive one another as individuals for our trespasses, but the Law, if it is wise, will forgive unto seventy times seven and overlook seven times more rather than convict on ‘cooked’ evidence and inflict punishments that however convenient they may be to the political situation of the moment, carry into the body politic a deadly poison—the poison of cynicism and loss of trust in one’s fellow-men as represented by the arm and majesty of the Law.

It is of course only too easy to prove that a district politically troublesome is also criminal—a few *agents provocateurs* can do that—and then one can profess to be punishing crime and not political dissent.

In the following chapters the writer hopes to convey something of the strange atmosphere which exists in India between the white and the coloured races, and which, if allowed to continue, must result in a dangerous explosion, almost certain to involve the whole East; ultimately drawing into its orbit the disgruntled Arabs, Afghans, and Egyptians, the Russians, as well as the Chinese and the Japanese, and even Burma, where a second Ireland is already being created and 'Home Rule' becoming the slogan. Such an explosion will probably in the end bring about the extinction of British influence in Asia, and result in ruin as widespread as was brought about by the late disastrous war in Europe. For nearly a quarter of the human race lives in the Indian Peninsula.

§ 8

For the benefit of those who have not yet visited India, it should be explained that of the three hundred and twenty millions who inhabit India, nearly all are Indian, or Hindu as they used to be called, by race. The majority of these people also belong to the Brahminist or Hindu religion ; the remainder being mainly Mohammedan. These latter might be described as the militant Unitarians of India, while the former represent what corresponds to 'Roman Catholicism' in Europe.

In addition to these two main religious divisions of Brahminist and Mohammedan, there are considerable numbers of Buddhists, Parsees, Christians, Jains and other less definite or more primitive religious persuasions. The Sikhs are a sect of Hindus who, as Nonconformists, separated from the Orthodox Hindu or Brahminist religion. Buddha, like Christ, was persecuted as a Nonconformist by the priests.

Owing to a kind of rigid Trade Unionism (Caste) which extends to marriage and family matters, these differences in religion tend gradually to create separate communities with racial religious and occupational distinctions. Often—as in Ireland—the religious differences are themselves partly due to slight differences in ancestry. Probably the majority of Indians who follow the Mohammedan faith have some slight strain of Arab blood; they are, in fact, not usually pure Hindus by race.

The antagonism in Ireland between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants has a close parallel in India, where the Brahminist represents an elaborately ritualistic 'Catholicism', and the Mohammedan a rigid and puritanical protestant 'Unitarianism'. As in Ireland, the antagonism between these two points of view is often intense; and, as in Ireland, it is capable of being exploited with great ease by an alien Government, acting on the principle of—Divide and Rule.

The Government in India can exaggerate, and deplore, or pretend to deplore, the very divisions, mainly religious but partly racial, which enable it to maintain its ascendancy over both contending parties. The trick of alternately favouring first one and then the other, and finally coming in majestically as a pompous peace-maker to compose the jealous quarrels which its own policy may have provoked, must obviously be a temptation to an alien and not too popular Government.

Unofficially, at any rate, the Englishman in India is inclined to favour the Mohammedan Indian as against the Orthodox or Brahminist Hindu. There are many reasons for this. The Mohammedan element, like ourselves, were originally alien military adventurers who invaded India. We came originally for the trade, the Mohammedans to possess the land; but neither of us was welcome to the Indian. Though the Mohammedans have been more or less absorbed, yet, generally speaking, they are nearer our way of thinking than is the Orthodox Hindu. Generally speaking, they are less educated, more sporting and turbulent, and less mystical and argumentative than the Brahminist Indian, whose ritualism and more effeminate culture do not appeal to the young Englishman. Incidentally, the Mohammedan Indians, who make better soldiers, hold the Old Testament in great respect. With their touch of Arab blood they are fonder of horses than the Brahminist Hindus. They have less local sentiment, and so are useful to us as soldiers and police in keeping their Brahminist brothers in order. They have no religious objection to eating beef or to the shedding of blood.

It is therefore quite natural that as individuals we should favour the Mohammedan minority in India at the expense of the more hostile Brahminist or Orthodox majority. To pretend by speeches in the House of Commons that we do not prefer the Mohammedan can surely deceive no one. We even prefer the Mohammedan to the Jew in Palestine, he is a far better comrade. As long as our occupation of India is essentially the military occupation of a conquered country, we shall require the support of the more warlike Mohammedan element, even though it is the less educated and the less civilized. When, if ever, our Dominion in India is established with the consent of the Brahminists and other non-Mohammedan Hindus, then we shall find, on the contrary, that the Mohammedan minority will be restive and discontented.

§ 9

In the pages that follow examples are given of incidents and conversations which illustrate the attitude of probably the majority of Englishmen in India towards the Indians.

The writer wishes to emphasize the fact that he is not attacking individuals, but rather a system that embodies the attitude of a conqueror towards a despised and conquered people, with whom he has not only no intention of mingling—as most other conquerors have eventually done—but with whom he does not even desire to have any pretence of equality or community of interests. It is this definite hiatus, this aloofness intended to be perpetual, that is not only so unique in history, but is probably at the root of our increasing difficulty in India as elsewhere. Englishmen, especially in the last hundred years, have become ‘ very bad mixers ’.

This attitude has itself created an atmosphere in which the primitive tendency to enmity, natural between strangers who differ in race, colour, creed and custom, has been vastly and unnecessarily exaggerated. Truly civilized men and women are supposed to have less of this primitive feeling, but in India we can be very primitive.

In any case it would be stupid to attack individuals who are so largely what they have been trained to be at their Public Schools. At school the Englishman is taught not so much to think out what is just, for himself, as to bow to the public opinion of schoolboys and young adolescents, whose crude, ill-formed, and prejudiced notions he must accept as if they were the well-informed, liberal notions and sympathetic judgment of experience and reflection. In the same way it is the public opinion of his regiment, or the station club, or Calcutta society he values—he would be well spoken of. But woe unto him whom all men—and Public School-boys—speak well of, for he is likely when he gets amongst natives or others whom he has been taught to look down upon, to be arrogant if not priggish.

After all, we English people do not really learn self-control at school, where we swear even at play; so why should we not swear at a ‘ nigger ’, and beat him too?

The Public School-boy advocates the whip and the firm-hand for the ‘ nigger ’ in India as cheerfully and as naturally as he did for his School ‘ fag ’. Unfortunately, like Solomon, he finds that the result of the rod gives no better results in India than it did on the character of Solomon’s son Rehoboam, who provoked a mutiny in Israel by his harsh behaviour, a mutiny that is still unhealed.

Contemptuous abuse, we are assured, breaks no bones; but does it not, even when used unthinkingly, have any effect on the user? There is a subtle contagion of the mind, a mute infection of thought, that reacts in vicious circles until a really hostile attitude results. For if we tell ourselves constantly that an individual or a nation is contemptible, we shall soon be showing open contempt if not something worse.

It would be interesting to find out how many Englishmen—if any—are born with a natural dislike to brown skins, and how many only began to dislike coloured people after they had been taught by some old ' Quai Hais '—seasoned and cynical old Anglo-Indians—that it was the correct thing to do.

It may be hopeless to attempt to change our ruling habit of looking-down-upon the Indian and showing him that we do so. We were told, long before Mr. Gandhi denounced English Governments for their ' Satanism ', that Satan's pride—his superiority-complex—had cast him out of Heaven; ours may certainly, after a period of misery and unrest, get us out of India.

Our temperamental excesses are coming home to roost. The reaction on our Home-Politics of ' bossing natives ', has brought us almost in sight of Revolution. Unless we learn to be more sympathetic abroad, we shall probably end by quarrelling really seriously amongst ourselves.

CHAPTER THREE

THE 'SCHOOL-BOY' SUPERIORITY-COMPLEX—AND ITS MANIFESTATION

§ I

THE incidents here given are described from memory. The writer has done his best to tell them as he saw them happen, or heard them recounted by Englishmen who were certainly not likely to have exaggerated their gravity. The Englishmen concerned have gone to their last account, swept away in the Great War and its miserable aftermath of troubles and wars all over the world. They were, for the most part, amiable and good-tempered enough in their dealings with other Englishmen of the same social standing. The worst cases have not been selected; indeed, if the Indian and European papers of the period be searched, records of many incidents similar can be found, and even reports of police cases of serious cruelty which are far worse.

Stripped of their oriental surroundings and reduced in scale, they are the characteristic incidents of an English Public School where weak people are supposed because of their weakness to be capable of ' cheek ' that must of course be punished by thrashings by stronger folk, and where the smallest and most timid of the new arrivals is the most bullied; where the social standing of a child's parents is criticized openly in his hearing and he dares not resent it; where every form of sneering and teasing is practised as part of the discipline and where even young children have their temper embittered or, if very sensitive, are driven into a neurasthenic inferiority-complex, almost even to suicide, by the continuous mental and physical torture inflicted upon them by their fellows as part of the school 'discipline'.

It may be true that there are at this moment fewer of these incidents, although the brutalizing effect of the Great War makes the writer doubtful on that point. But, if the underlying spirit of which these incidents are but the outward expression remains the same, what guarantee can there be that similar incidents will not occur?

Quite recently the writer encountered in a London hotel two well-to-do Englishmen who had served in India after the war. They disliked the Indians and said so quite frankly. They described incidents in which they had themselves taken part. In the one case it appeared that they were travelling first-class with two friends in India, when an Indian of some importance, who also held a first-class ticket, entered the carriage. They endeavoured to prevent his entry, but he insisted. Annoyed at his persistence and not desiring his company they locked the fat little man in the lavatory. Later, one of them having occasion to use the lavatory, it was decided to wait until the train slowed down passing through a junction, and then to hustle the Indian out of the carriage on to the line and throw his baggage after him. This was done. The Indian, though he rolled down the embankment, was not apparently much hurt, for he ran after the train in wrathful indignation. The writer has heard many such incidents described and even seen something of this sort taking place during his travels in India. The other Englishman described a rather worse case. At the station at which he was serving he and his friends were much annoyed by the fact that an English nurse employed by a British officer in the garrison was in the habit of walking out with a young Indian who was paying her attention. It was decided to follow the couple one evening and give the Indian a sound beating for his 'presumption'. The couple were surprised and a brawl ensued. Infuriated by the resistance shown by the Indian and by the fact that he had been seen with his arm round the waist of the English girl, the Englishmen decided to make an example of him. He was carried to his hut and nailed by a certain very tender and essential portion of his anatomy to one of the posts of the hut, which was then set alight. He was apparently given the choice of being burnt or mutilating himself seriously.

It is, of course, quite possible that both incidents were either untrue or exaggerated, but surely the significant thing is that *they can be told* by those who claim they took part in them, and that one should be expected to listen and approve of such behaviour. Certainly the attitude of many Englishmen in India towards the Indian makes these stories by no means unlikely.

Young men who have recently left Public Schools and Universities admit that their outlook, and especially their attitude towards those they are afterwards called upon to govern, is influenced by what may be called the School-prefect mind—it is, in fact, ' cheek ' for anyone not of the same race or antecedents to question their opinion or action.

This complex of ' cheek ' remains fixed throughout the lives of very many ex-Public School men. Orders, however rash, unreasonable or unjust, or however brusquely or even insolently given, must be obeyed, or the offending one will be treated with insult or with the physical violence which a prefect of an English Public School—who is himself little more than a child—may inflict on a somewhat smaller child—some third-form boy who dares to question his authority, or whose manner he dislikes, or who is not sufficiently submissive and subservient to satisfy the *amour propre* of his lordship the prefect.

The English upper classes, even from their earliest years, are thus taught to exalt Authority—even when it is wielded by a school-boy in his teens—and abase Reason. Unfortunately other races have the temerity to imagine that Authority that is intolerant of Reason is not an Authority to command moral support or respect, even though it be backed up by the prefect's cane, or the boot of an irritable official.

As a result of this early training, we have now got to the stage when we consider it to be ' cheek ' for a Belgian or a Hindu or a member of some weaker race than our own to demand social or economic equality or to argue against our decisions. One hears the word ' cheek ' used frequently whenever any weaker or smaller power lays claim to some disputed island or territory. We have, in short, the prefectorial-complex—a state of mind quite incompatible with the theory embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The ' proofs ' of these incidents were submitted to several young men who have recently left Eton and Harrow and other Public Schools, some of them as prefects. They were returned with the admission that they exemplified the prefectorial attitude—the schoolboy's domination-complex. It is supposed that the playing of games and the much belauded discipline of team work acts as an antidote. But why do we deny that one of the main objects of games is to defeat—and just that much humiliate—our fellow-men, and so proportionately increase our own pride and self-confidence, qualities by no means already lacking in the average young Englishman of the Public School class. The team spirit—so unattractive to us when it shows itself in the discipline of the wolf-pack or in the combination of a gang of cat burglars—has of course its good co-operative side, it also works as a form of *esprit de corps* against inconvenient questions in the House of Commons, as we discovered during the Irish Rebellion.

The maxim concerning ' Never hit a man excepting your own size ' has, since the Boer War, become unfashionable. It would hardly suit the Public School system where a prefect, himself little more than a child, and at the most neurotic, irritable and erotic period in his life, is allowed to flog and to ' discipline ' the smaller children. Anyone who has been himself a prefect at a Public School knows that the system—if it can be called a system—saves the schoolmaster a good deal of trouble. The schoolmaster will tell the parents that it has a good 'hardening' effect. Not long ago the House of Commons was informed by an ex-Harrovian Prime Minister that when the Almighty had anything 'hard' to be done he found an Englishman to do it. The spectacle of an old Harrovian of the upper middle classes rendering a kind of 'first-aid' to The Creator of the starry Universe would not, of course, raise a laugh at Harrow—perhaps after two thousand years of gloom a Pharisee may have laughed in the Underworld.

§ 2

Borrow, of the Indian Civil Service, was a young Magistrate in Karpore and popular enough with his fellow Sahibs, both Civil and Military, until an unfortunate incident happened at a Hindu Temple about twenty miles from the Cantonment.

A detachment of an English regiment, three officers and perhaps a hundred men, had been out in camp near the Temple going through their company training.

It appeared that the men had shot a number of the peacocks belonging to the Temple, roasted and eaten them; and had afterwards unfortunately done much worse things. The Temple had, in fact, been used as a latrine! When remonstrated with by some Hindus, they had given them pretty rough treatment.

The Temple Peacock is considered as almost sacred in India, and is frequently fed by the Priest of the Temple. Just as the dove is the symbol to the Christian of the Holy Ghost, so has the Peacock to Hindus a peculiar and mystic association. Hence its sacredness. Now however little an Englishman in India is interested in the country, he learns this fact concerning peacocks very soon after he arrives in India. The defilement of the Temple, even though it might be in bad repair, and appear to the casual observer more or less deserted, was of course disgusting and unpardonable.

Complaints about this occurrence reached the District Commissioner's ears. They were met at first by denials on the part of the officers and men concerned; so young Borrow was sent out to investigate and report.

Borrow found that the complaints were justified. English surnames and unedifying remarks in the Billingsgate vernacular had been scribbled on the walls, and the remains were found of torn letters from England addressed to English soldiers. The bones of the peacocks and the ashes of the fire strewn about the Temple were also fairly conclusive evidence. Moreover the officers of the detachment, when further questioned, admitted that some of the peacocks had been shot and eaten 'by mistake'. They had clearly failed to keep order amongst their men.

But why should they respect the Temple of a non-Christian and superstitious faith?

In the circumstances Borrow was bound to report that, as far as could be ascertained, the Hindus' complaint was more or less justified. The officer commanding the company was mildly censured, and it was even suggested that some of the men concerned should be sent out to clean up the Temple!

But that was not the end of the affair. For not having exonerated his fellow Englishmen in an affair with Hindus, Borrow was promptly put in ' Coventry ' by practically the whole British Station. No one appeared very anxious to play tennis or bridge with him. In the club bar where every white officer and business Sahib is wont to forgather for cocktails, Borrow's entrance would be the signal for a frosty silence, and then a slow melting away of the assembled company. And because they were anxious to keep in with the Military element in the Station, whose regimental bands supplied the music at the club dances, even the senior Civil Servants, instead of supporting their comrade, began also to give Borrow the cold shoulder.

He, in fact, became thoroughly unpopular all round; a striking object-lesson in the social danger of impartiality in India, whenever a conflict between the susceptibilities of white skins and brown skins is in question.

§ 3

Three officers and myself were in the train on our way up country from Bombay to Delhi.

It was very hot and we were thirsty and generally bored. For want of something better to do we were throwing our empty soda-water bottles out of the window, and watching them burst on the line with startling effect on the gangs of Indian railway workers who were working barefooted, repairing the embankment by carrying earth and gravel in baskets on their heads. Whole families, including young girls and quite small children, some of them quite naked and hardly big enough to be able to carry anything, were working in long perspiring lines in the torrid heat.

It occurred to me, as it probably would to most people in England, that the splinters of glass were likely to get into the bare feet of these people, especially the children, and I suggested that perhaps we had better 'cease fire'.

My companions, quite good fellows, thought it was absurdly sentimental of me to 'worry about the feet of a lot of damned niggers who had thick skin and were little more than animals'. Only by rapidly changing the subject did I avoid falling under the unbearable suspicion of being a pro-Indian.

Afterwards I heard from the Medical Officer in charge of one of the railway staffs that he had a number of coolies always attending his dispensary for foot injuries caused by broken glass. Incidentally, he assured me that the skin of the Hindu, who is not of course a negro, is no thicker than that of the average European.

This incident is of course trivial, but yet significant of our attitude towards the ' nigs '—otherwise our Hindu fellow-subjects in India.

§ 4

A number of Europeans were detraining at a small Indian railway station.

Each of us having tents and other heavy baggage to send up to his bungalow had instructed one of his servants to procure a country cart for the purpose.

That evening, to my annoyance, neither my servant nor my baggage had arrived at my bungalow. At the Mess, Brown, an officer, told me he had given a ' native ' a good thrashing at the station for disobedience, and that he had heard afterwards that he was my servant. He explained that the man was cheeky. ' He was sitting on an empty wagon which I wanted, and actually refused to get off.'

I told Brown that the man had only been obeying my orders in taking the wagon and retaining it for me. Brown said he was sorry, but he ' never allowed a native to argue the point ', and that in any case as he did not understand Hindustani the ' mistake ' was inevitable.

I was indignant. Brown had been a long time in the country and I did not think the excuse particularly good. On my return to my bungalow that night I found the Hindu servant in question had been carried home injured, and was in a cellar where my servants slept. I found the man, or boy rather, for he was not more than seventeen, in a grave condition with two of his ribs broken and covered in bruises. He confirmed Brown's story. He had told him that the wagon he was sitting on had been procured at my express order, and that I had forbidden him to give it up to anyone. But Brown had refused to listen to him, knocked him off the wagon, kicked him severely, and left him apparently unconscious.

Astonished, I questioned the station-master and a number of others who had been present. It was clear that the boy had merely continued to say the wagon was already taken for another Sahib. He had not been cheeky, but had given my name as the officer for whom he had taken the wagon. The boy was fragile, even for a Hindu. I doubt if he weighed seven stone. Brown was one of the biggest men in the district and weighed probably thirteen or fourteen stone.

At lunch-time the following day, fearing the boy might die, I mentioned the matter to the Senior Officer who was mildly sympathetic. 'It's unfortunate it happened to be your servant, but Brown is an efficient officer if a bit hot-tempered; after all there are plenty more of these niggers, and I daresay he will be all the better servant for having had a good hiding.'

Nobody seemed to think much of the incident; the only thing they regretted was that I was inconvenienced by the loss of my servant.

The boy grew worse, developing a high temperature and some pneumonia over the site of the broken ribs. Being still uneasy, I decided I would risk unpopularity and mention the matter to the Cantonment Magistrate, who was also an officer. On my inquiring for him at the club I found he was away on a month's leave and that an officer of Brown's regiment, who was junior to him, and who also had 'no use for natives', was acting as Cantonment Magistrate in his place.

Not wishing to become marked as a 'pro-native', and to be shunned by the only white people one had to speak to, I let the matter drop. Eventually the boy recovered sufficiently to be able to travel back to his home, though still looking miserably ill. I never saw him again. Though this incident was rather a bad case, it was fairly typical of many others that one either saw happen, or heard of quite frequently during one's service in India.

It is only fair to add that it was a very hot day, and the boy's manner may have been irritating, and that he no doubt, like most weak, underfed and nervous people in menial service, made the most of his injuries. Also his frailty of physique made it easy to injure him. The officer concerned has gone to his last account; a confirmed negro-phobe, he was not a bad fellow otherwise.

§ 5

K. and I were both keen on photography.

One morning we went into a small Indian shop in which K. said he had left some snapshots to be developed. We were both in uniform. The shop-keeper, a little fat man who, but for his swarthy skin, might have been mistaken for one of the bald-headed cashiers in a London Bank, after fussily searching, informed us that he did not think K. had left him anything to develop.

K. became indignant and impatient. The little fat shop-keeper, evidently anxious lest he should offend two important customers, searched again, but the snapshots could not be found.

Apparently they were some snapshots K. particularly valued, and he became furious. The shop-keeper became quite positive that they had not been left.

K. called him a thief, and a liar, and also used other very abusive Hindustani epithets, obscene enough but commonly used amongst the lowest classes, vile words which young English officers learn from their low-class servants. The shop-keeper, perspiring now with fright and agitation, was horrified at the use of such epithets to a man of his position; doubtless the obscene words were familiar enough to him, yet it was an indignity. He became mildly offended. This only had the effect of driving K. into a fury at this barefaced 'insolence to officers in uniform'. Jumping over the counter, he unmercifully belaboured the little man, who eventually fled howling into the back premises of his shop.

K. and I then proceeded to hunt ourselves for the photographs, and a pretty mess we made of the shop. Eventually we left feeling intensely annoyed with ' natives ' in general and this shop-keeper in particular.

Outside the shop K. suddenly turned around and pointed to another small shop at a corner opposite. ' Look! that's the shop, we were in the wrong place. I've just remembered the name.'

So we got the photographs. The incident made an amusing story for our friends at lunch-time.

We neither of us heard any more about the matter. But I wonder what would have happened had we behaved in a similar way in a shop in London. But after all India is very trying to the temper!

§ 6

Smith was a keen sportsman, his principal quest being a record ' head ' of antelope.

He had one failing, he was mean about money, and would never take out sufficient coolies to bring home his trophies. He would reckon on obtaining the chance services of a villager. Unfortunately he was not always very particular about paying his coolies when the spoils had been safely lodged in the verandah of his bungalow.

One day Smith was lucky enough to shoot a very good antelope on the outskirts of a village about six miles outside the Cantonment. As the coolie he had with him was already over-loaded with rifle, lunch-basket and other paraphernalia, Smith directed him to shout to an old man who was sitting outside a small Hindu Temple that belonged to the village.

But the coolie explained that the old man, though scantily clad, was a Brahmin Priest, and unable by his creed and his caste to pollute his hands with the blood from a carcass.

Smith wanted badly to get the antelope carried home before sunset; besides he was the type of Englishman to whom all scantily clothed persons must be mere coolies. In any case the old man was a 'native', and accordingly should do as he was told.

'Brahmin be blowed—tell him to come over here and pick up the carcass, and I will give him six annas (about 6*d.*) if he'll carry it back to my bungalow.'

Still the coolie was doubtful. The Brahmin, he explained, was the village Priest in charge of the Temple which was dedicated to Vishnu. Vishnu, the second Person of the Hindu Trinity, particularly abhorred the shedding of blood.

Smith became very impatient. He had certainly no intention of leaving a fine trophy for the jackals to eat; and as there appeared to be nobody in the village but women and children, the coolie was ordered to fetch the old man.

But the Priest, understanding what was going to be the nature of the command, refused to move from the platform outside the Temple. Apparently it was the hour for prayer. Smith, although not in uniform, considered this an 'insult to the British Army', besides being most provoking to himself. He proceeded to administer corporal chastisement on the astonished old Priest, before an audience of amazed and scandalized village urchins and women, who had come out on hearing Smith shouting at the old man.

Having vindicated the honour of the British Raj, Smith proceeded to the spot at which his horse and groom were to meet him. But the news of the affair had spread to the men of the village returning from their work; and the villagers' indignation, according to an Anglo-Indian's ideas, had passed all bounds.

Furious at having failed to recover his trophy, Smith became still more angry at the ill-looks of the villagers whom he tried to chase away. Eventually he became surrounded by an angry crowd who took away his rifle and, tying his hands behind his back, marched him back to the British Cantonment, where they handed him over to the English District Commissioner.

The Commissioner spoke sternly to the Indians, and Smith was, of course, immediately released. He was afterwards reprimanded for his tactless behaviour. The two chief inhabitants of the village who had taken part in inflicting such indignity on a British officer were suitably punished.

In the circumstances it is possible that the other villagers were made to suffer indirectly, for in those days—if not to-day—it was woe betide a village which had been known to make itself offensive to a white Sahib. Did not the white Sahibs and their officer friends control the police, the irrigation, and the assessment for taxation? It is not well to quarrel with the Powers-that-Be!

Yet which of us who were at Public Schools, who have served in India could, were he still alive, blame this young Englishman for what he did? Clearly, to an ex-Public-School boy, it *is* ‘ cheek ’ for an inferior —so obviously an inferior in every way—to refuse to obey a comparatively reasonable order. For a half-naked ‘ nigger ’ to refuse to obey a British officer is almost incredible ‘ cheek ’, especially when the officer belongs to a crack regiment and the ‘ nigger ’ is a half-starved villager. But in this case the ‘ nigger ’ was actually employed in one of those ‘ filthy haunts of superstition ’, a Hindu temple, and he was presumably meditating upon a religion which is ‘ a foul superstition ’ largely concerned ‘ with brothel-keeping and dung-eating ’. The young officer had read these and similar denunciations of Hinduism in reputable English newspapers and weekly journals. Can he be blamed for believing them or for thinking that the ‘ nigger ’ in question, seeing how vile was his religion and philosophy, probably deserved a good thrashing anyway?

Besides all this, the blunt refusal to obey his order, or even to come and discuss the order, was an implied insult to the British Raj in India, and was he, as a commissioned officer, to allow our rule in India to crumble because he was afraid to chastise, with a firm hand, that nasty-looking old man who was nearly naked? It was not the young officer that should stand in the dock, it is the Scribes and Pharisees in England who formed his intolerant and arrogant outlook, and who, knowing little or nothing of Hinduism, allowed their parochialism and religious hatred to get the better of their reason. The writer contends that in not one single case of the examples he has given did the assailant really deserve censure, because they had grown up in an atmosphere that made their conduct perfectly natural and, indeed, under the circumstances, reasonable. The writer remembers when serving as a youngster in a cavalry regiment that the officers of this regiment invariably referred to the doctor of the regiment (an Oxford graduate) in terms of contempt as 'that damned apothecary'—what these officers would have called a Hindu priest hardly bears thinking about. One of these officers afterwards filled a very high post in the service of the Crown, and shortly after his tenure of office disaster overtook us—perhaps there may be some connection. If a man despise his brother whom he hath seen, he is not likely to love the Irishman or the South African and he will probably loathe the Hindu.

Not long before this incident happened in India, a somewhat similar dispute had occurred at the village of Denshawai, in Egypt. Denshawai became famous —it would be better to say infamous.

Two British officers started shooting pigeons close to the village of Denshawai. The owners of the pigeons came out from the village and objected. The officers apparently resented this, and during the argument with these ‘ natives ’, one officer fired and wounded one of the Egyptian women. This, though almost certainly an accident, naturally made matters very much worse. The other officer, getting alarmed at the attitude of the villagers, ran away into the open country; his body was found some time afterwards without any sign or marks of violence; it was fairly clear that he had died from sunstroke, combined with the effects of fright or over-exertion in the tropical heat.

In revenge for this officer’s death, the English authorities permitted seventeen of these Egyptian villagers to be either hanged, flogged, or transported for life! To make matters worse, the wives and children of these wretched men were compelled, according to the official account, to witness the hanging of their fathers and husbands.

Many eye-witnesses of this miserable crime are still living in Egypt; and yet Englishmen profess to be surprised that so many Egyptians never want to see an Englishman again. Perhaps some Egyptian poet has written a new version of ‘ Lest we Forget ’.

Evidently the inhabitants of the Indian village who objected to their village Priest being beaten without any provocation, ran a very serious risk of sharing a part of the fate of the unfortunate Egyptians at Denshawai.

Probably the affair of Denshawai will never be forgotten in Egypt. It was fully reported in the Continental papers, and in many English ones; accounts of it also reached India and Burma. In Ireland, Denshawai was used with effect, and of course the demand for Home Rule was stimulated.

§ 7

I was the culprit myself. One day driving a pair of ponies along a narrow road I saw approaching me a bullock wagon driven by a Burman.

Being in a hurry I did not feel inclined to draw up, and continued to occupy the centre of the road, on either side of which was a steep declivity leading down into swampy rice-fields.

I was going at a good pace and the Burman, seeing that I had no intention of yielding any road-space, tried to draw up on the extreme edge.

But the incline was too steep and his wagon somewhat top-heavy. As I passed him his bullocks flinched and started. The next moment I saw the wagon with its occupant rolling down the declivity into the rice swamp. As it rolled the broad awning of matting and bamboo was crushed, and I heard screams mingled with the sound of broken crockery.

Rather appalled at the result of my selfishness I pulled up, and sent my Burmese groom to inquire what real damage had been done.

Apparently there were four women and a child in the wagon. The child was comparatively unhurt, but the women were, from his description, injured.

Telling him to hold the ponies I went back myself. As far as I could make out the women were very badly shaken, possibly they had some internal injuries. The pole of the wagon had snapped, one of the oxen had broken its leg, and the whole of the household utensils of the family, who were moving from one village to another, were smashed.

The head of the family, the driver, had escaped with some bruises and a bad graze on one of his legs.

I expected to be received with a very surly demeanour, for obviously I was to blame, and the Burman was only a very poor cultivator. To my surprise I was met with civility, almost with a smile as he limped towards me. He evidently considered it a great mark of condescension that I had stopped to inquire about the damage.

As well as my broken Burmese would permit, I suggested that I might help to make good the damage, which I estimated at the very lowest could hardly have been less than £4, an enormous loss to a Burman in that position in life.

The man shook his head deprecatingly at the suggestion.

I returned to my ponies and, after discussing the situation with my Burmese groom, I sent him back to the Burman with thirty rupees (about £2), telling him to tell the Burman where he could find my bungalow should he think better of his refusal, and allow me to pay for the rest of the damage.

My groom, however, returned with the money. The Burman driver had smilingly refused to take anything, suggesting that the accident was largely his own fault.

I remembered as I listened that night in the Mess to the usual tirade against Orientals, and the frequent references to the Burmese as ' insolent and seditious swine ', that I felt I ought to have stuck up for them.

And the quiet and easy-going Burman has at last got fed up with our methods learnt in Ireland —the tyranny of our imported Sikh police. He resents being treated with less consideration than we give to our dogs and our horses, and is demanding Home Rule for Burma. It will be a nasty ' Ireland ' to tackle. Roads are scarce, and in many parts the jungle is thick.

The cheapest way to ' Black and Tan ' the Burman will be to use Sikh or Gourkha troops to ' shoot up ' the Burmese villages. The worst Black and Tan excesses will in that case be easily outdone, and there will be no *Daily News*, or *Manchester Guardian*, or *Freeman* inconveniently to expose our methods. So no doubt we shall in due course succeed in turning one of the happiest and kindest-hearted people in the world into sullen and resentful foes. No doubt the London newspapers will then deplore their hostility and hatred as unreasonable.

The stage for this miserable tragedy has already been set, the overture has been played. I suppose we shall go on with it.

§ 8

In Calcutta the European, whether business man or Government official, is apt to be nervous and to exaggerate the importance of small incidents—incidents which if they happened in Cornwall would scarcely be reported in the Plymouth newspapers, are telegraphed to London from India and duly reported at length in the columns of our leading newspapers.

A native policeman on duty in Calcutta was approached by two small Hindu boys who deliberately threw stones at this guardian of the Law who wears on his buttons the cypher of King George the Fifth!

The cables to Europe throb with portentous news of this sort. Within forty-eight hours three continents are considering how soon India will have to be reconquered. It is held that such a significant straw must presage the onset of a mutinous hurricane: 'England has been too tolerant and the Liberals and the Socialists have obviously spoilt the Natives.'

At the Calcutta Police Station, little Manik Chand, aged 9 years, and Lalli Ram, aged 11, explain that the policeman is their uncle who has robbed their mother of some household property, and taking their mother's denunciation to heart, they had thrown stones at him.

But this explanation is never reported in the English newspapers, never reaches the ears of members of Parliament, who, carefully 'prepared' by the accounts of this and similar ' outrages ', proceed to approve of further repressive measures which the Indian Government had asked them to sanction.

§ 9

Almost any stick will do to beat a dog who has been called ' seditious '.

A Lieutenant-Governor of an Indian province in a public speech justified his severity to some millions of Bengalis, and his refusal to recommend further self-government, on the ground, amongst other reasons, that youths in some of the Hindu schools and colleges were frequently being expelled for immoral conduct. Such an excuse could only have been put forward as an attempt to create prejudice, to stir up the ultra-prudish and the ultra-pious in England to be politically unjust on ' moral grounds '; never a very difficult task.

The Governor omitted to point out that these youths were far older for their age than English boys, and that many of them were already married, but were yet being subjected to much the same childish discipline and judged by the same standards as English schoolboys. Even so it was strange that this Governor should have chosen schoolboy misconduct as one of the grounds on which he opposed political reforms. Had he not himself been to a certain English Public School where the boys' morals, in spite of their being subjected to much less temptation, were not always all they might have been; and where, in spite of a conspiracy of silence, scandals necessitating expulsion would be discovered?

Supposing a foreign statesman solemnly declared that one of his reasons for denying any extension of the franchise to the citizens of Manchester, was the amount of immorality at—shall we say—Eton. Would not such a ‘ statesman ’ be at once conducted to the nearest home for imbeciles? Yet it is quite common to hear puerile and hypocritical reasons such as this advanced as a justification for refusing self-government to millions of adult Hindus and Mohammedans.

Not so long ago English women, for reasons of vanity, were in the habit of tight-lacing or constricting their bodies in such a way that not only were their internal organs horribly deformed, but their general health and maternal functions were seriously interfered with. Stupid as was this fashion, it would have been monstrous if some alien power had justified its interference in our affairs on the ground that this ugly, dangerous and crippling exhibition of national vanity showed that the English people were unfit for Independence. Yet it is often on grounds of this sort that we pretend to justify our actions in China or India and the sending of missionaries backed by gun-boats.

Twenty or thirty years ago the English newspapers were full of reports of cases of alcoholism, diabolical baby-farming, wife-beating, and cruelty to animals, yet no one suggested that these things could only be suppressed by the presence in London of a German Army.

The propaganda carried on in England against the ' morals ' of nations whose territory we covet or are occupying, such as the Egyptians or Chinese, is only another exhibition of our exasperating insincerity when we wish to find ' moral ' reasons for continuing to do what is otherwise indefensible. Indecent photographs can be purchased in New York and London as well as Cairo or Calcutta, but what that has to do with the Englishman's or the Egyptian's right to Independence is not very obvious.

§ 10

The English schoolmaster in India often has queer ideas as to how love for British rule and respect for English ' fair play ' can be instilled into the youth of India.

The Headmaster of a certain school in India wished the Hindu boys to learn to play football, and the boys were asked to subscribe to buy the ball. At the time there was discussion in the Press as to how the local industry could meet the increasing competition of Japanese and European goods. The elder boys requested the schoolmaster that the ball should be Indian-made. The schoolmaster considered this an impertinent request, and ordered the football from an English importer at Bombay.

The schoolboys, believing themselves to be patriotic, refused to play with a ' foreign ' football. The schoolmaster, highly incensed at such ' seditious ' conduct, flogged some of the older boys as an encouragement to the others. This provoked a good deal of local indignation amongst the Indians, but many Europeans thought he had done right in nipping such ' seditious ' action in the bud, especially as many of the boys were almost completely grown-up.

Some of the facts were actually reported in the Press as an example of the ' growing unrest and sedition ' in India. On such incidents as this many a leading article demanding repressive measures against Indian Nationalists and ' Agitators ' has been partly based.

§ II

What an Englishman was capable of doing ten or twenty years ago in India he is almost certainly capable of doing to-day, provided he could do it with impunity. Human nature and the treatment of conquered races change but slowly. Many will have forgotten the opposition that arose to Lord Curzon when he was Viceroy because of his action regarding the punkah coolies who were ' accidentally ' killed by men of an English regiment in India. This discussion at least proved that the life of a coolie was not thought worth making a fuss about by the average Englishman in India.

Doubtless there was something to be said from the point of view of the regiment.

A sergeant or a man returning late at night to a heated barrack-room after partaking fairly freely at the canteen of beer or whisky is not likely to be in the most amiable and reasonable frame of mind. He finds the barrack-room suffocatingly hot. One or more of the miserable undersized little Hindus who ought to be pulling the punkahs have fallen asleep. Awoken with a kick from a stalwart Lancer on a very tender part, he is perhaps resentful and ' cheeky ', and receives in consequence several more kicks and blows. In the morning the punkah coolie's body is found in the verandah covered with bruises and with some of the internal organs ruptured—usually the spleen.

No one supposed that in each case the man had been deliberately killed, but the circumstances did point to the fatal injuries having been inflicted by one of the men who slept in the barrack-room; and the regiment, having repeatedly failed to produce the culprit, was at the Viceroy's order penalized.

This was considered to be a terribly ' pro-native ' action on the part of the Viceroy!

Coolies employed about the barracks in India are lucky if they draw a few pence a day for their labour, out of which they are usually made to pay commission to native contractors and even to the English regimental quartermaster-sergeant. Many of these coolies are afflicted with malaria or other tropical diseases. The writer has often found them suffering from huge splenic tumours and almost comatose from high fever when actually at work. They are so weak that, contrary to what one would expect, they feel the heat and fatigue of labour in a hot climate, and at night, as much as or even more than a well-fed European, for their physique is wretched, and they are underfed.

The soldiers' complaint was that these weakly and incompetent punkah-coolies who often fell asleep during the night out of sheer exhaustion should not have been employed.

Anyway the late Lord Curzon lost the battle. He got no support from Official India. In any case it was unwise to make a scapegoat of a regiment that had considerable social influence in England. Besides, it was not so much the regiment that was really at fault, as the spirit in which His Excellency and his predecessors had been 'governing' India. What the Viceroy scorns and his gilded staff ridicule, the private soldier will kick; and kick pretty hard when he is full of beer.

§ 12

A Unit was returning from camp and had halted close to a Hindu village for the night's bivouac.

As is customary, though prohibited, many of the men strolled off after dusk into the village in search of a little excitement, some cheap and intoxicating liquor and the eternal feminine.

The Englishman, like all ' Puritans ', is apt to be a rough and uncouth lover; and as usual an altercation arose about a Hindu girl. An old Hindu, her grandfather, had threatened to come over to the camp and report the behaviour of the English soldiers to their Commanding Officer. He was knocked down and severely injured.

The next day, Sunday, the troops remained in bivouac. In the evening the Commanding Officer was informed of the affair, and also that the old man had died. The Medical Officer attached to the Unit was asked to examine the body.

The old man had evidently received a severe blow on the left side of his body. Judging from the rapidity with which he had died it was clear that some severe internal injury had been caused. It was admitted that an old man had been struck because he had interfered with a soldier molesting a young Hindu girl.

The Commanding Officer, fearing a reprimand from the Indian Government because his men had been out of camp during the night, was naturally not anxious to admit that they had been. An attempt was made to prove that the old man who had died was not the one that had been struck; but this defence proved untenable. It was then suggested that the Medical Officer should carry out a post-mortem examination and ' find ' that the old man had died of heart disease or something of the sort. Fortunately the relatives refused to even discuss a post-mortem.

Eventually the Unit moved on and nothing more was heard of the case.

§ 13

Another Unit on its way back from camp had occasion to cross a river across which was an ancient and somewhat precarious bridge-of-boats. Higher up the river a more modern bridge had been lately constructed to take heavy traffic.

The Commanding Officer either mistook the road, or, deciding to use the shortest route, had led his men and guns on to the old bridge. The leading sections had not got far, when an Indian arrived breathless, and declared that the bridge they were on was too weak for troops, and urged them to return and cross by the stone bridge. Naturally he did not realize the difficulty of turning guns when they are already on a narrow and rickety bridge.

The impertinence of a mere ‘ native ’ warning a Commanding Officer as to the safety of his guns, was certainly provoking; he was told to betake himself to a particularly warm region. To the amazement of all, the man persisted in his warning, stating that he was an inspector of roads in the employment of the local rajah, and responsible for the proper use of the bridges.

The Commanding Officer, who had dismounted and was leading his horse in front of his Unit, was so annoyed at the man's persistence that he struck him a blow on the jaw so violent that the man fell off the edge of the bridge into the water.

Whether he ever got out of the river again I do not know; but the Unit considered that the punishment fitted the crime. The Commander, an excellent fellow in many respects, was afflicted with a terrible liver, and also disliked Indians intensely.

What became of the Indian? Possibly he was not much hurt; on the other hand, the river, though low, was fairly swift, and if, as I suspect, he sustained a broken jaw or was partly stunned, an alligator may have finished him.

The local rajah could hardly have heard of the incident for there were no Indian witnesses. He would perhaps suppose that his official had been killed by robbers or a tiger and cheerfully appoint a successor.

§ 14

At one time I was stationed in a fort in one of the principal cities of India and was frequently driven to my work outside the fort by K., a brother officer. He was a good fellow, but, like many Englishmen in India, had developed an irritable, ungovernable temper, especially in his dealings with natives.

K. was usually even later for breakfast than I was, and to save time we would generally, though it was contrary to regulations, drive out by a narrow road which was reserved only for vehicles entering the fort.

This road, cut through the high grassy mound or glacis outside the fort, had banks faced with brick on either side. It was so narrow that it was almost impossible for two vehicles to pass. Almost invariably we found it blocked by incoming hay-carts driven by natives who had orders to enter by this road.

K., after a hurried breakfast, very much afraid of being late on parade and a bit liverish from the night before, was generally in a bad temper. His fury would literally know no bounds when we found our progress impeded, as we often did, by the hay-carts entering the fort. It was just possible by forcing the native carts hard up against one wall for us to pass.

The Hindu drivers of these hay-carts were of the ill-fed and less intelligent type common in India. They usually failed to respond sufficiently smartly to K.'s furious orders to clear the road, shouted at them in broken Hindustani mixed with English oaths.

Enraged at what he called their stupidity, K. would slash at them wildly with his whip, hitting them over the head and face or anywhere he could reach.

The poor wretches, who were more or less in the right when we were obviously in the wrong, would cower from the blows, or screaming with excitement leap from their carts and dart away, leaving the road a jumbled mass of bullocks and hay-carts. The bullocks, unattended by their drivers and feeling K.'s lash, would swing violently round in the road, sometimes upsetting their loads. So, generally speaking, our morning exit from the fort was somewhat hectic.

I used to implore K. to ' go a bit easy '; usually it was no use. What made it so much the worse was that not only were the wretched Hindus whom he slashed so vigorously almost naked except for a narrow loin-cloth, but that besides them, seated on the hay, and almost equally scantily clothed, were their womenkind and often small children and babies.

The lash of K.'s whip must have cut many of them across the face and breasts, and perhaps have even injured their eyes. Sometimes a child would roll off from the top of the hay in the excitement, and generally this exhibition of ill-temper was so disgusting, that each morning I used to vow myself I would never go again.

But alas for human frailty! Morning after morning I would find myself late at breakfast, and only too glad to accept K.'s offer of a lift; and then again would come this wretched fracas with these terrified and quite helpless and ignorant native drivers.

Had any one of these wretched natives, stung to indignation by the lash applied to himself and his womankind, sprung from his cart and thrust a hayfork through K.'s body or my own, as would certainly have happened in most other countries, the wretched creature would have been tried and executed for sedition, because we were in uniform and ' on duty '; and pompous leading articles in the London newspapers would have demanded ' firmer Government in India '.

§ 15

It was Sunday and, as usual, most of us were out shooting.

I had shot two or three antelope and gazelle and was enjoying my lunch beneath the shade of some mango trees. The carcasses had been brought in.

A native who had been watching came up, and having salaamed respectfully, proceeded to inform me that he was a Brahmin in charge of a school in one of the neighbouring villages.

As he appeared to be intelligent I inquired about game in the neighbourhood. Rather reluctantly he gave me some quite useful information.

As I started to move on he asked permission to ask a question.

' Can you tell me, sir, why on your God's holy day you come out to kill these antelopes? Is it as a sacrifice to Him? '

I explained that it was a holiday and that I was fond of shooting.

He seemed puzzled.

‘I know, sir, that the English Sahib often is shooting, but why do you like to shoot these creatures, what harm have they done to you? ’

Rather nonplussed by the question I told him that Englishmen for generations had been accustomed to shoot game, and found it a healthy and amusing sport. I added as an afterthought that perhaps the antelopes did a certain amount of damage to the crops.

The Brahmin appeared to be more or less satisfied. After a moment he expressed a wish to know why we also enjoyed shooting ibex, and other harmless animals in the mountains, that do not touch cultivated crops.

Not having a reason I allowed him to see quite plainly that I did not wish to continue the conversation.

Perhaps after all the inconsistency of punishing natives for minor offences when we spend our holidays and Sundays killing graceful animals, not because they are harmful but merely for sport, is more than we can expect them to understand.

Do we ourselves understand it?

Perhaps if I had told the Indian how children of the English upper classes are ‘ blooded ’ at their field sports, he might have understood my action better.

Children who, when they have grown up, will go out to rule the coloured races are taught to glory in being ‘in at the death’. If they are lucky an approving huntsman will smear their faces with blood from the stump of the tail cut from the mangled and perhaps still living body of a fox that has been already half torn in pieces by a pack of hounds. ‘Smarming’, as we call it, is the reward for a young ‘sportsman’—girl or boy—who has followed the hounds. So the child proudly bears upon its forehead the mark of blood. If I had told my Hindu questioner this, he might not have believed it; but had he done so, my Sabbath day occupation of killing might not have puzzled him so much.

§ 16

During the hot weather in Central India many Sahibs sleep on the lawns outside their bungalows or the Station Club.

One night I was awakened by a native messenger who mistook me for the Orderly Medical Officer for whom he had been sent from the hospital. I informed him that I was not the Captain Smith he had been sent for, and pointed out where he was sleeping. Presently I heard a whispered conversation followed by loud grunts of annoyance from Smith’s bed; coupled with very forcible injunctions addressed to the messenger to ‘clear out’.

A little later, judging by the noise, the messenger had evidently returned, and again roused Smith’s anger by bringing a note from a Nursing Sister urgently summoning him to the hospital. This time the unfortunate native, who was a regular Indian hospital messenger, was evidently too persistent, for, leaping out of bed, Smith seized the man's stick from him and proceeded so to belabour him that most of the members of the club who were sleeping out were awakened by the man's cries.

The next morning in the club, Smith, a hot-tempered but amusing man, described how some ' damned fellow ' had come worrying round in the night and he had given him a jolly good hiding for his trouble.

I do not remember that anyone expressed disapproval; such an incident was sufficiently common to be soon forgotten by most of those who heard of it.

Such exhibitions of temper are not always confined to the men. I remember an officer's wife laying about her Indian groom with a whip because, having given him a somewhat complicated order in not very intelligible Hindustani about the disposal of some parcels, she thought at first from his report that he had left them at the wrong house; an inadequate knowledge of Hindustani on the lady's part, and a hatred of ' natives ' being at fault throughout.

Women on occasions in India can be even more bitter and vindictive over the failings, real or imaginary, of the Indian than their husbands; although in spite of the large number of English women of all classes and of all shades of discretion who travel alone in India, it is extremely rare to hear of any of them being insulted or in any way molested by Indians.

§ 17

As a doctor working in India it was part of the writer's duty to guard the young Englishman serving there as a soldier against the danger of contracting venereal disease. The young Englishman in India is as God made him and not as Mrs. Grundy or Mr. Comstock would have liked to have had him made. Recognized brothels existed which it was part of my duty to inspect weekly. They were, and I understand are still, maintained in every British cantonment for the use of the soldier who is not able or not willing to marry, and who is not content to practise total abstinence or, as St. Paul delicately put it, ' to burn ' in India. English and Americans may regard this arrangement with disapproval or with horror, but it is only fair both to the British and Indian authorities to say that it appears to be all but inevitable.

The young English soldier, a fine young animal physically, is not sufficiently developed mentally to be able to choose a lifelong mate wisely, nor does his economic situation nor the necessities of his service in India, nor a climate so unsuitable and expensive for European women and children render it desirable that the young soldier should be permitted to marry. What, then, is to be done?

The more games he plays, the less his mind is developed and the more his body becomes the master. Even a rudimentary knowledge of the male physiology points the way to the obvious dangers and unpleasant alternatives to which these young males are subjected in a tropical climate where a large and comparatively speaking attractive population go about in a semi-naked condition. A resort to unregulated prostitutes, a drugging of the sex inclinations every evening with alcohol in the regimental canteen, sleepless nights with alternating fits of irritability, morbid introspection and self-abuse, prohibited intimacies with his fellows in the barrack-room, fits of melancholia and religious frenzy relieved by some bestiality (non-human) or perhaps suicide. No doubt self-control can achieve a good deal, especially in a cool climate, but the more self-controlled part of the population do not find themselves serving the British Crown in a tropical climate for three shillings a day. Nor, it may be added, do the critics of these young men in England or America ever have to face the same set of unpleasant and difficult alternatives in their early manhood, when, owing to the heat, many hours of the afternoon must be spent lying half-naked on one's bed, the nights so overpoweringly hot that sleep is impossible, and naked forms so seductively in evidence in every bazaar and in every street.

Whatever opinion or opinions we may hold on this most difficult subject, the fact remains that these brothels exist in all countries where climatic conditions are similar and where the opportunities for marriage are restricted socially or economically. The occupants of these establishments are young Indian girls—Hindu or Mohammedan, usually of an age somewhere between twelve and thirty. It is extremely difficult, birth-certificates being usually absent, to know what any woman's real age is in India. If unattractive or elderly women were admitted then—human nature being what it is—the young British soldier would look for more attractive mates on the highways and in the byways, running increased risks of contracting disease and thereby reducing the health and efficiency of the British Army of Occupation in India.

But in such a hot climate one must drink, and the young like the old often drink, as they make love, not wisely but too well. So, on occasions, the British soldier will seek for the company of these young women in a quarrelsome condition due to drink. I remember one hulking brute, stupid, ignorant—innocent, almost—who, in a fit of unreasoning rage, had brutally maltreated one of these poor girls. Unknown to us and probably to herself she must have been already suffering from syphilis. The man had struck her full in the mouth and many of her teeth had been broken. In the course of a week or two her assailant appeared before me with the undoubted signs of syphilis on the knuckle of the hand with which he had struck this poor child. It was a just punishment indeed for his behaviour and would make a fine text for a lurid outburst at a Salvation

Army meeting about Drink and Vice. But such denunciation is too easy. It is easier to be sober in Glasgow and in London than in Lahore, where the overpowering and debilitating effects of a tropical climate have to be resisted. One may criticize the spirit of our governing classes in India, but that is not to say that it is easy for an Englishman to behave out there with the same moderation which he is compelled to show in England.

What is noticeable is that those who have suffered the greatest repression of their normal sex propensities in youth are more likely to experience fits of brutal revulsion towards their paramours, an explanation, perhaps, of the saying that 'The Puritan makes a rough lover', venting his annoyance at his own temporary want of self-control upon his companion whom he had promised to pay, and whose need for money he had been quite ready to exploit for his own gratification.

This schoolboyish misbehaviour in India possibly would not occur if we were more approachable—if we could trust ourselves to quarter Sikh and Mahommedan troops in London as the French quarter their African and Asiatic troops in Paris and other large French cities. Can *our* prestige only be maintained by a greater ' distance ' than the French find necessary? Do we fear lest the Indian troops discover the nakedness of our land—our poverty, slums, social sores and discontents?

CHAPTER FOUR

PREJUDICE AND PRIDE; FEAR AND INDIFFERENCE

§ 1. *Indian Morals and 'Mother India'*

WHENEVER the political, social, and economic problems of India are discussed, we are apt to find ourselves overwhelmed by a whirlwind of denunciation concerning Indian 'sensuality and sex immorality'.

The latest example of this is that the criticism of Indian morals in *Mother India* is actually being used to prove that Indians are unfit for further self-government. If the statements in *Mother India* are not exaggerations, they rather suggest that further steps towards self-government are needed; for in matters of morals 'salvation cometh from within'.

It is a common phenomenon in history that nations who have not complete self-government are inclined to lose their self-respect and with it their desire for self-control. In any case the fact that a Hindu living in tropical Bengal is or is not more sensual than an Englishman in London can be no reason why he should be considered politically incapable of self-government. His low morale is the result of a sense of subjection and forced tutelage.

But if the conditions as they exist to-day in India are examined, and we ask ourselves whether in similar circumstances and a similar climate the behaviour of three hundred millions of more or less poverty-stricken and overcrowded Europeans would not be at least equally ' immoral ', what would be our answer? Would it not be a very damaging admission?

Generally the criticisms of Indian morals start with an attack on youthful ' depravity ' and early marriage.

Undoubtedly marriage too soon after puberty is undesirable; but a very important point is that a girl of twelve or thirteen in India is, owing to climatic and other influences, often as advanced in her sex development as a girl of sixteen or seventeen would be in England; and with this development there is of course a corresponding advancement of sex inclination and appeal to the other sex.

The same applies to the Indian boy, who is in reality several years older than a youth of equal age in England.

Seeing that in many cases our grandmothers in England were actually married between the ages of fifteen and eighteen, it is surely absurd for English people to hold up their hands in pious horror at the fact that what took place in England between young people in our grandmothers' time, is still taking place under the tropical sun of India between young people in about much the same state of sex maturity. It is both cruel and futile to treat young persons who are sexually developed as if they were sexless, whatever their age may appear to be from the birth certificate.

Poverty, over-crowding, and stress are far greater in India than in Europe, and the expectation of life is very much less; these influences combine both to increase the precocity of the young, and to diminish the motives for continence and self-control. It is not only in India that the prospect of having a short life rather suggests self-indulgence, especially in sex matters. Those whose lives are in imminent danger, or who are already miserable, have little to gain from being thought 'respectable'. Did not we ourselves learn this fact from our soldiers during the Great War?

The climate of India has not only what might be called a ripening effect in bringing young human beings to premature sexual maturity ; it has also the effect of stimulating the sex impulse in both young and old; this is one of the reasons why it has been found extremely difficult to insist on sexual continence amongst the young English soldiers serving in India. Until recently, at any rate, brothels were established in all large military stations in India and regularly inspected by officials.

The majority of Indians are not only ignorant and over-crowded, but owing to the heat and their poverty very scantily clothed. In the hot weather many of them sleep without covering, and practically naked, a habit Europeans copy during the hottest months. Whole households of several families, including both sexes and all ages, are thus crowded together at night. Unless marriage between these millions of more or less mature young people is permitted, and even encouraged, the amount of promiscuity, incest, and disease would inevitably be increased enormously.

The poverty of the masses in India is intense and widespread. There is often a real difficulty in feeding the daughters, who, being in many cases sufficiently mature to be *wives*, though scarcely mature enough to be *mothers* with advantage, are better off in many respects if married. If unmarried, the temptation and the tendency for great numbers of them would be to become promiscuous; or, if short of food, to practise open or secret prostitution.

The effect of this would be an increase in disease and illegitimate children. Birth-control is at present almost unknown, and the birth-rate in India is already much too high; any increase in the illegitimate birth-rate would in any case be very undesirable.

The whole problem is aggravated by the overbreeding and widespread poverty; but even allowing for this the solution of the moral problem is much the same as for countries nearer home, namely marriage for young people fairly soon after puberty, combined with birth-control until both parents have reached a more complete maturity of mind and body, and have got sufficient means to bring up their offspring in some sort of decency and comfort.

Well-meaning people anxious to enforce the conventional morality and immorality of London, Leeds, Paris or New York, amongst the millions of overcrowded Indians beneath their tropical sun, are going to increase the miseries already present in India, multiply enormously the opportunities for the Indian police to exact blackmail, and generally to increase the present discontent, and make confusion worse confounded. We have already in India plague, frequent famine, malaria, dysentery, slums, cholera, and underpaid labour amounting to economic servitude. If we are going to do anything, however well intentioned, that will add to the discontent, and increase the already sufficiently abundant prostitution and venereal disease, we had far better leave India altogether.

Education and economic factors, combined with common sense and the instinct for self-preservation that all races eventually develop, are the best guardians of sex-morality. We, as Governors of India, have sufficient to do to remedy the poverty and political discontent and lack of education.

It may be that Indian ideas on ‘ depravity ’ and sex-morality will never conform to those that obtain in colder climates. Any such uniformity might be disastrous either to over-crowded India, or to the more slowly breeding European. Our morals in sex matters are largely dependent on our need for population or otherwise.

In any case, nations living only a few miles from our shores have official brothels and hold views on these questions differing from our own; there is not the slightest reason why we should expect the Hindu to conform to English ideas, any more than the Frenchman or the Egyptian—quite the contrary.

The absence of privacy, the heat, and the poverty in India make any tendency to immorality much more obvious to an observer than the same amount of misbehaviour would be in Europe. In the same way the classes in England, who, because they are overcrowded at home, have to do their philandering in public, are supposed to be more immoral than those whose wealth provides them with other interests, retards the precocity of their young people, and always ensures greater privacy for their misbehaviour.

§ 2. *Odium Theologium*

There can be little doubt that the superiority-complex which the Englishman displays so abundantly in India is partly due to his having been brought up to despise the Indian as a pagan, and a worshipper of images, or idols such as cows, rivers, and other natural phenomena.

After all, why should one be civil to a ' heathen ', whether he be Chinese or Indian?

The natural Protestantism of the English upper middle-class is revolted by the florid and extravagant ritualism of the Brahminist or Hindu Religion.

Yet a close and reflective observer can readily find an amazing number of similarities between the worship of the Hindu Trinity and the more ornate forms of Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism in Europe. But then, in religious matters at least, members of the English upper middle class are not always very observant or reflective.

One can find in India not only every kind of ritual, but every stage of religious belief, from the simplest forms of Tree-and-Spirit Worship up to a belief in a Trinity that is itself a mystical Unity that may not be spoken of. Above and beyond this Unitarianism are beliefs in a Universal Energy—an Over-Soul, a Self-Perceiving and Self-Conceiving Mind; beliefs that end in the cloudy speculations of Philosophic Rationalism. But the average Englishman in India does not come much in contact with the more lofty heights of Brahmin speculation; what he does see is a number of village folk or townsmen making, as did the patriarch Jacob, obeisances to Pillars of Stone, anointed with oil or daubed with red ochre. Forgetful of the fact that he himself in England shows reverence and respect to altar-stones, cenotaphs, and crucifixes, he is scandalized to find simple Indian villagers doing much the same thing, but to rather differently shaped Symbols. Forgetful that the Lamb and the Dove, and in some parts of Europe the Pelican and the Sacred Fish, have a deep and mystical significance in his own religion, he is disgusted to find that the Serpent, the Elephant and the Monkey are profoundly significant Symbols for the Orthodox Hindu. If it is permissible in Europe to touch your forehead with holy water before worship, why is it degraded to smear your forehead with ashes or pigment before entering a Hindu Temple sacred to the second or third Person of the Hindu Trinity?

That relics of the Ritual and Philosophy of Babylon, Nineveh and Egypt still survive to some extent in modern Hinduism need not cause us to forget that this is also true of our own Religion; and that there are obvious signs of a revival of pagan mysticism to-day amongst the more ' romantic ' and neurotic of the inhabitants of England and America.

There are symbols in use in India that have a phallic origin, but it must not be forgotten that many authorities believe that certain signs and symbols in common use amongst ritualists in Christian Europe have an identical origin and association.

Rival religionists are notorious for their hatred and jealousy of one another, and the Christian Missionaries in India have been no exception. Forgetting the religious wars and much other evil that has been done in Europe in the name of Christianity, they would fasten upon the religion of the Hindu the responsibility for his low morale, and for ills, physical and moral, from which the Hindu has suffered from time immemorial, and which directly or indirectly originate in his climate and economic surroundings.

Famine and flood, plague and pestilence, malaria and dysentery, an overwhelming birth-rate, combined with an impoverished soil and an enervating tropical climate, would even in a perfectly governed Christian country soon lower the general morale.

The religion of India is rather an expression of the Hindu's history and difficulties, than the cause of his decline and present subjection to a war-like European invader.

To make the superiority-complex based on our English contempt for all ' heathen ' people more pronounced, we have had added to this Protestant Odium Theologium of image worshippers, Mr. Kipling's patronage for the 'Lesser breeds without the Law'. A sort of Kiplingesque Jingoism has become a cult at our great Public Schools, and has encouraged the young Englishman, already imbued with a sufficient sense of his superiority, to adopt an even more contemptuous pose of lofty scorn towards 'natives' and foreigners generally; especially towards those who are non-Christian and happen to have brown or yellow skins. Mr. Kipling's point of view is very popular now with the French and Italian 'imperialists' in Africa and Asia, and they are already having the same difficulties!

It may be one of the ironies of history that the writer who has been held up almost as the Apostle of Empire, should have encouraged his countrymen in an attitude that has made the continued existence of their Empire so uncertain.

It is hardly necessary to point out the incongruity between the creed and tenets of the religion which the Englishman is attempting to spread in India, and his own actions, social, personal, political, and economic in Asia generally. To preach Christlike gentleness, self-control, and humility is always difficult; but for the English conqueror of India to preach and advocate these virtues to the Hindu in subjection is decidedly humorous. Neither can we English pretend that in India we are personally very temperate, moral or forgiving. So it is not surprising that the Indian, judging our religion by its lack of results on ourselves, is not inclined to adopt it. Yet to many English people this disinclination is only one more of his obstinate and vicious failings.

The Indian's religious philosophy not only gets the discredit of being the cause of his moral failings and his political decline, but also of being the cause of certain social customs which the modern Englishman disapproves of. Yet it should be evident that many of these customs can be accounted for by the fecundity of his race, the scarcity of water, the prevalence of diseases that destroy his young men and the gradual impoverishment of the soil.

There is, for instance, the objection to the remarriage of widows. This objection is fairly strong amongst Orthodox Hindus, just as it is amongst many Roman Catholics in Europe, though for a different reason.

To understand this objection in India one has to realize that in India it has always been the privilege of Indian women to control their own property after marriage, and also to have a legal share of their husband's property on his death; a privilege which English women have not even yet obtained.

The mortality amongst young males in India has been, and still is, much higher than amongst girls of the same age; but, except amongst certain tribes and castes, there is a strong objection either to an Indian girl remaining unmarried, or to her adopting prostitution as a means of livelihood. As in Europe until quite recently, the unmarried girl had few openings, especially if she were of the better class. It followed from this that unless female infanticide was to be practised on a large scale, numbers of young girls must marry elderly men or widowers; men who were encouraged, when able to support more than one wife, to take a second.

So it happened that many millions of young girls were, and still are, married in India to men considerably older.

Women are much alike all the world over whatever the colour of their skins. Now in a country where a wife, who has been married perhaps to an elderly man whom she did not choose for her husband, is expected always to prepare his food unaided and unobserved, and where coroner's inquests are unknown, and deadly poison-plants grow on almost every roadside, and cremation is general, there would be an obvious temptation to get rid of a husband who was elderly or too exacting or uncongenial. This temptation would be greater in a country where mortality is so high, where cholera and other swift and fatal diseases are prevalent, and where a multitude of dangerous animals, insects, and poisonous snakes might so easily account for a sudden illness. It was all the greater in ancient India because, unlike her English sister, the Indian woman retained all her own money and had the right as well to her dead husband's estate.

Obviously, compared with Europe, the opportunity for husband murder in India was abundant, the inducement considerable, and the chance of detection extremely slight.

Having disposed of her elderly husband, whose body, being burnt, would leave no trace of poison or foul play, the Indian woman could marry a younger man of her choice, and live with him in comfort; or remain unmarried, to have perhaps love affairs with her Confessor—usually a young Brahmin Priest—or some other man. Eventually she would leave her estate to the Priest to swell the power and fortune of the Hindu Orthodox Church, in those days already sufficiently rich and more than sufficiently powerful.

To neutralize this very obvious temptation, the Hindu law-givers encouraged the belief that widows were 'unlucky'; the tradition that forbade widows to remarry under any circumstances; and the custom that they must spend the whole of their widowhood waiting on their mother-in-law—the mother of the very man they might be suspected of murdering!

Cruel as this may seem it did at least discourage the murder of husbands, and even their serious neglect; and it also prevented the too rapid growth in wealth and power of the Brahmin Priesthood and the Great Temples. A well-to-do Hindu girl who lost her husband would thus often consent to take the customary dose of opiate and to mount her husband's funeral pyre, there to commit Suttee. She preferred to be burnt rather than to spend the remainder of her life as the 'unlucky' servant of a perhaps suspicious and tyrannical mother-in-law.

Yet missionaries have much exaggerated the frequency of this suicidal practice. In all India the cases of Suttee were always rare. It was in any case seldom a widow in the poorer classes who committed Suttee; in her case, whether she lost her husband by accident or design, she could escape her mother-in-law by becoming a prostitute, or a mistress; or by working as an ordinary coolie; or, if of a low caste, she could find a man of a still lower caste willing to marry her although she was a widow.

When we condemn child marriage in India and the prohibition of re-marriage for the 'unlucky' little widows, we have got to realize that while India remains such a poor country, the alternative to early marriage is likely to be either increased prostitution or a return to female infanticide, or both. Improved hygiene may lower the death-rate amongst the young men, but equally so amongst the young women, so the problem will remain.

In a similar way one can trace the economic cause for other Indian customs which we English people consider superstitious or ridiculous. Take, for instance, the Hindu's 'worship' of his horned cattle and his objection to eating their flesh. In a country that depends so largely on wells for its water, and on horned cattle for drawing this water to irrigate the crops, cattle are obviously indispensable. This is all the more the case in India because milk and butter form two of the main ingredients of the Hindu's food. In a country where this is the case and where fodder famines are frequent, it would be impossible to replace from other provinces cattle lost in famine time, or through age, if they fetched, not the low price which in such a country draught-animals fetch, but a much higher price as valuable meat.

The cow or bullock keeps a great part of Indian cultivation and civilization in existence, so the Hindu, economically speaking, would be indeed a fool if he did not ' worship ' an animal on which his country is so dependent. The cow's milk is his principal food, the dung often his only fuel, and there is nothing terribly depraved, in any case, in his obstinate refusal to eat the flesh of a draught-animal that has been his most faithful servant. We in Europe refuse to eat the flesh of our own draught-animal—the horse—and for much the same economic and sentimental reasons.

And he has other reasons for refusing to imitate the Mohammedan, or listen to the persuasions of Christian missionaries who fondly hope to destroy his adherence to Brahministic religion by teaching him to slaughter and eat his cows! A queer method of obtaining converts to Christ.

It is known that abscess of the liver, a very fatal disease in India, is many times more common amongst those who eat pork or beef in the tropics than amongst those who are more or less vegetarians. In this and other matters the religious traditions of the Hindus resemble the Mosaic Laws in that they have often a sound economic, physiological, or hygienic basis.

Then there is the custom, often condemned, of marrying girls who are unable to find husbands to the Fig-Tree; and afterwards allowing them to be brought up as courtesans. This custom, confined to certain tribes and castes, is not quite as depraved as it sounds. If, in a huge tropical sub-continent like India, prostitution is to be permitted AT ALL—and even in England we cannot forbid it—it is more likely to diminish the spread of contagious diseases, if those who are to get their living in this precarious way are at least instructed to be clean, and trained to avoid adding to the numbers of illegitimate children, with the consequent temptation either to bring the children up as prostitutes or to destroy them by infanticide.

We are reminded that the ancient Greeks permitted a definite class of educated and sometimes accomplished women—the Hetaîræ—to carry on this ancient profession; arguing that if their young men were to consort at all with loose women, it would be best if the women were refined and educated and taught to be specially clean. The Greek and Hindu customs have at least a common hygienic utility. Prostitution is not made any the more bearable or advantageous to society if it is permitted to be practised at random by ignorant and unclean women of all classes, as it is in England to-day.

However much we may deplore prostitution, it is no use, considering the conditions of the streets of London, Leeds, and fifty other European cities, and the amount of venereal disease, to denounce the Hindu's past attempts to solve a difficult social problem; so much more difficult in a poor, thickly-populated, and tropical country. A problem which we in England, in spite of our advantages, have not yet solved ourselves.

The poverty of India, because it is extreme, appears to the visitor to be degrading. Probably such extreme poverty is always degrading, for perfect cleanliness of body and clothing in a climate where profuse sweating is the rule, costs a good deal of both time and money.

There is so much poverty, such a shortage of fuel, that the offal and road-sweepings have to be collected and dried for use as fuel for cooking purposes. British troops during the South African War were obliged to do this; yet one often hears Englishmen and women pointing with disgust at the Hindu men, women and children busy with this necessary but humble occupation. It is unreasonable to reproach with degradation those whose only crime is extreme poverty. After two hundred years of being ruled by well-paid Englishmen, this poverty is the curse of India; and we cannot pretend that Indian poverty was always as extreme as it is to-day.

Nor is it only Englishmen brought up amidst the respectable surroundings of well-to-do England that forget what it means to have been accustomed from earliest childhood to the squalid poverty of an Indian village. Miss Katherine Mayo in her book *Mother India* emphasizes the degradation in India much more than the terrible poverty that is its chief cause.

Even Miss Mayo would have been less horrified with the Hindu's familiarity with ' cow dung ' had she had to keep quantities of this useful fuel in every coal-scuttle in her own house, and been sent out as a child to collect it from the road.

The danger of well-to-do foreigners, European or American, trying to rebuke and advise poverty-stricken Asiatics was never better exemplified than by the tone of her book. Farm labourers in countries much nearer home than India could have told

Miss Mayo of some astonishing uses that are made of objects and materials which would shock the genteel suburban residents of Boston or London.

When all the millions of India are as well off and as comfortably housed as Miss Mayo, no doubt their objection to handling manure will be as pronounced as hers. The writer has seen Indians in famine time feeding on chopped leaves and other garbage.

In India, as in Europe, cases of abnormality are common, and instances of besotted degeneracy of all sorts by no means rare; but it is unfair to assume that they typify the culture either of Europe or India. Miss Mayo's sensational account is ' carefully documented ', but anyone familiar with Indian prisons or English prisons knows how easy it is to be sensational. For example, not long ago it was stated that thirty per cent. of all cases in which young English girls had been seduced were cases of incest between father and daughter! It would be so easy to write sensational accounts of English or American ' depravity ' if one wanted to.

A race that has produced, and still produces, saintly philosophers, and that has covered the vast Indian Peninsula—an area nearly as large as Europe—with cities and temples that are still amongst the wonders of the world cannot be composed of debauched men and erotic women.

Unfortunately Miss Mayo's book will be used as an excuse for more severity, cruelty and injustice; and can only result in greater hatred and mutual contempt and aversion, and a more intense ' anti-pagan ' campaign by militant missionaries, and so in worsening the relations between white men and brown men in India.

§ 3. *The Indian Disarmed*

Throughout the greater part of India the Indian is forbidden by the English authorities to carry arms.

At first sight this would appear to be justifiable. The arms would be liable to be used in disputes or to commit armed robberies; or stolen from their lawful possessors and used for improper purposes; above all they would make armed insurrection against the Englishman's rule in India possible, though it would still be extremely difficult.

If this last possibility be considered its gravity diminishes. The modern development of aircraft —tanks, poison-gas, artillery, wireless telegraphy and machine-guns—has made armed insurrection by peasants and others who think themselves oppressed almost impossible; particularly in a country such as India, where large bodies of disciplined troops and police are maintained at or near all important strategic points as well as in the larger cities.

The other objections against the Indian cultivator having arms would apply equally to the inhabitants of the more remote districts in most European countries where, if destructive wild beasts were as plentiful as they are in most parts of India, the demand for permission to have firearms would be considered reasonable and would be in fact irresistible. Certainly armed robbery might increase, although the fact that the householder was provided with arms should normally act as a deterrent.

But it is not the bad characters amongst his fellow-men that the Indian living in the country districts of India has so much to fear; it is rather the numerous and destructive four-footed enemies that still abound.

There are few country districts in India in which either antelope, wild-pig, wolf, jackal, or some much larger and more dangerous animal is not a constant danger either to the Indian himself or to his cattle and crops. Panther and tiger, wild-dog, and bear may be rare in many parts, but there are others where they are a serious menace both to human beings or to cattle.

The writer has often seen within a walk of one of the larger Indian cities large herds of antelope or gazelle feeding on the lucerne and other fodder crops; patches of Indian corn and sugar-cane ploughed up by wild-pig; and wolves lurking in the ravines close to herds of goats or horned cattle.

Not long ago it was stated that eighty thousand Indians were killed every year by wild animals. Even deducting the many whose deaths were no doubt due to venomous snakes, there yet remains an enormous number, including small children, who are killed by the more ferocious of the wild beasts. To this number must be added many of the thousands who ‘ disappear ’, and whose bodies are never found.

Nor is it only that such numbers are killed or maimed. The fear of attack will prevent many villagers leaving their village, or even their house, after dark unless they are in a party. The writer has himself, when on horseback or on a bicycle, encountered on a main road wolves and other animals that would have terrified, if they had not actually attacked, children or any old or weakly person on foot and unarmed.

All this the Indian is expected to put up with in order that English rule shall not be endangered, or the sporting facilities for the English official in India be destroyed by the extermination of all animals dangerous to men or cattle or which seriously damage the Indian's scanty crops.

Either every Indian having business outside the large towns should be permitted to possess a rifle, or else the Indian Government should take serious steps to exterminate all animals that are a danger to him and his property.

At present not only are permits to shoot large game very sparingly given, but large areas in India are actually reserved for the preservation of tigers and other such animals. Owing to the size of these areas it is impossible to fence them adequately, and as shooting in them is restricted, numbers of big game are constantly ravaging the fields and cattle in the neighbouring districts.

The Indian cultivator has already more than he can do to preserve his crops from the flocks of green parrot and other birds that will in twenty-four hours strip his fields almost as badly as an army of locusts.

It seems amazing that he does not more resent the disability imposed on him by the Government, when he has also to watch herds of antelope grazing on his crops, or wild-pig breaking into his plots of sugar-cane. The sporting facilities which all Englishmen so much enjoy in India have to be paid for by the added danger and want of the already poverty-stricken cultivators.

One of the rather pathetic sights common in India is to see quite small children mounted on rough platforms in the fields endeavouring with their rather feeble cries to scare away from the crops the huge flocks of birds, and herds of wild animals such as antelope and wild-pig.

These children are allowed to sleep during the day when their parents are at work in the fields, but they are often left out all night—the fear of wolves ensuring that they keep awake—and remain on the platform, which may be half a mile or more from the nearest house.

In the early morning light their small figures can be seen, and their monotonous cries, hoarse and feeble after their night-long vigil, can be still heard at intervals. It may sound cruel for the cultivator to use his own small children, or even to hire others, to act thus as human scarecrows, but life in India for the cultivator is for the most part hard and cruel. Besides, what else is he to do? It would at least diminish his difficulties if the Indian Government organized the extermination of his four-footed enemies.

No doubt we shall have the sentimentalists denouncing the wholesale destruction of ' beautiful wild animals '. If the sentimentalist had to go without his dinner for a week, and keep his eight-year-old son up all night to make certain he did not also have to go without his breakfast, he would, at the end of the week, have very little left to say in favour of ' beautiful wild animals '.

Unfortunately so few Englishmen who visit India either as officials or tourists have ever tried to live unarmed in any one of the hundred thousand small villages of India. Had they done so they would realize that packs of jackals and half-wild pigs can be unpleasant customers when one is alone and on foot. Yet the Indian children, small girls and boys, who work in the fields as soon as they are able to walk, have to face not only dogs and jackals but often the risk of meeting animals much more dangerous.

In other parts of India the alligator kills many children and women when bathing. Usually bathing is done from the river-bank either at dawn or dusk. In the half light the huge, motionless and unwieldy body of the alligator caked with mud can be easily mistaken for a large log. Should any human being come near him, the alligator can be amazingly agile although he is often more than twelve feet long. When shot he is frequently found to have the remains of metal bracelets, anklets and other ornaments in his stomach. Possibly some of these may be from the half-charred corpses that are placed in the river at the Burning Ghauts or Cremation Stations on the river-banks, for wood is scarce, and the Indian can rarely afford sufficient to consume entirely his dead relatives, but a number of the ornaments are without doubt from the bodies of children or adults who have ‘ disappeared while bathing ’.

Except at one or two special places, alligators are not ‘ sacred ’, and there is no doubt that if all the numerous riverside villages were permitted to possess rifles, they would shun the immediate neighbourhood. The scavenging which they are supposed to perform is just as extensively carried out by the many other less dangerous animals that are to be found on the banks of the larger rivers.

It is amazing what extraordinary arguments will be advanced against killing off the large game in India. People, otherwise quite sensible, will maintain that it is cruel vandalism, or that there is no need to worry about the amount of damage done to crops, or the number of cattle or human beings that are killed, injured or terrified by wild beasts; because ‘ many more persons are killed in Europe by motor-cars ’! Or else one is met with the blunt statement that the Indian increases too fast and needs killing off! If that is so why not permit Infanticide, Suttee or even Human Sacrifice? It is remarks and arguments such as these made at English dinner-tables in India with Indian servants waiting that must have originated the idea still prevalent in India that the English introduced plague, tuberculosis, and syphilis into India in order to keep the population down! If it is necessary to keep the population stationary—an arguable proposition—we can encourage emigration or birth-control; it would be absurd to condone such haphazard methods of reduction as that effected by the preservation of dangerous wild beasts. We might as reasonably encourage immorality, which also reduces the natural increase.

The arguments cannot be supposed to have been meant to be taken seriously; but unfortunately an Indian in a district infested with destructive or dangerous beasts, when we forbid him to have a rifle, must have every reason to suppose that they are really meant, and that policy has been determined accordingly. In some districts, in order to preserve our very enjoyable sport of pig-sticking, the Indian is discouraged, if not forbidden, to shoot the wild boar. What sort of impression must we Englishmen have created during our two hundred years in India, if this diabolical suggestion concerning our introduction of plague could so easily gain credence amongst the Indians? Certainly many English people in India, and even in England, talk loudly and very callously about the Indian ‘ increasing too fast ’; they forget the impression this must have upon the Indians waiting on them, especially if they have experienced rough or harsh treatment of some sort from the speakers.

It is not fair—in India or anywhere else—for a foreigner to prohibit the means of defence until he has removed the dangers.

There is another though no doubt a less pressing reason why it is unfair to prohibit the Indian from being trained in the use of arms, whether as a Boy

Scout or in village rifle associations. On the frontiers are many warlike tribes, Gourkhas, Pathans and others who have not been or cannot be disarmed, to whom the Indian populations, emasculated by being unaccustomed to self-defence, would now fall an easy prey. This fact provides us with an excellent excuse for remaining indefinitely in India—an excuse based partly on the results of our deliberate policy!

Do we expect the Indians not to realize and resent this?

It is argued that India has an army of Indians under English officers as well as the British garrison, and that therefore no Indian except those in that army need know anything about self-defence.

This argument might be reluctantly accepted in a compact European country with an army officered by its own citizens. Even then, if it had turbulent neighbours, the prohibition against training and the use of arms would be resented. It would be held that games and sports were in the circumstances hardly sufficient preparation. But in India, with only a ‘ composite ’ army, and mostly foreign officers, where traditions or conditions make training in games impossible for the majority, where there are so many potential raiders in the mountainous frontier district, the argument has much less weight, particularly as the defencelessness of the people is used as the main excuse for prolonging an alien domination. In fact the argument cannot be expected to be thought convincing or even particularly honest.

When, if ever, the English garrison leave India, and the English officers retire from the composite Indian Army, India certainly will be for a time at the mercy of the Afghan, the Gourkha and the Pathan and other border tribes. If we really mean what we say about eventually giving India some form of Home Rule, we should encourage and not discourage the training of India's manhood in self-defence.

For very obvious reasons—our memory of the Indian Mutiny is one—the composite Indian Army has been recruited and organized in such a way that it is absolutely dependent on English control for its cohesion, even for its very existence. It would certainly fall in pieces without its English officers; we have taken good care of that. Racial antagonisms and religious prejudices have been methodically used to counterbalance in nearly every regiment any tendency to or possibility of unity—and so of serious mutiny. Thus, as noted in the Army List, a Hindu regiment will contain a company of Mohammedan Indians and vice-versa.

‘ Divide and Rule ’ has been and may have to be always more or less our motto while we stay *as conquerors* in India; but that is no reason why genuine grievances should not be redressed and that quickly, lest we lose the support in India even of the small numbers of Indians who still may trust us. The less we depend on these calculated subtleties of Oriental policy inherited from the bad old traditions of the East India Company, and the more on general contentment, the longer we shall be able to stay in India.

§ 4. *The Stranger within the Indian Gates*

If you would rule a sub-continent containing nearly a quarter of the human race you must know the people you are ruling. And the more you know about them the better. In such a case, more than ever, ' Knowledge is power, ignorance is the worst sin.' And to know people it is necessary to understand them, their religion, philosophy, and way of life. And to understand a race is often the first step to mutual toleration if not to actual liking. Trite and obvious as this statement is, the behaviour of many influential Englishmen in India shows they would not admit its truth, and so unconsciously they strike at the very roots of our hold on the great peninsula.

A case brought to the writer's notice by the individual concerned illustrates this.

A young English officer, a good sportsman and a good soldier, a member of a family with long traditions of service in India, was appointed to a high-class Brahmin regiment in the Indian army, his brother being at the time a magistrate in the Indian Civil Service, his father a retired senior Indian civilian.

Having heard much from his father about India, and being warned that he could not do better than learn as much as possible about the people and country, he took the opportunity of visiting one of the principal Brahmin Temples, and observed as a spectator the religious festival that was being celebrated. It happened that many of his Indian subordinate officers and men were attending also, as well as other European spectators.

At the conclusion of the ceremony the Indian officers and men respectfully thanked him, supposing that he had been sent to represent the regiment, as had been the custom until the Englishman and the Indian got on bad terms about twenty years ago. He learnt that until the present strained relationship between the two races had become general, it was the custom as a matter of courtesy for several English officers of Native Indian Regiments to attend the principal annual ceremony at this Temple. It had even been the custom once for the Commissioner and other senior English officials to attend in uniform.

The next day the young officer was to his surprise reproved by his Colonel for ‘ messing about in one of these pagan temples ’. The officer explained that his father had advised him to show every consideration and courtesy to his men’s religion, especially as he was joining a regiment of high-caste Brahmins; his father had told him that was the best way to strengthen the English hold on India and to improve the loyalty of his troops.

His Colonel was not satisfied. ‘ That may have been all very well in your father’s day, but I prefer you to spend your spare time playing polo, or tennis, or bridge at the club, and not waste your time messing about looking at Indian Temples and all that sort of thing.’

The Colonel’s action was generally approved by the Station; and the young officer took the hint—

as indeed he had to. The writer some time afterwards asked him some question about the customs of India, and the young man told him that though he had been then several years in an Indian regiment, he knew little more about the country and its people than any intelligent tourist 'could find out in three months'.

Another officer in an Indian regiment had much the same story. 'My Commanding Officer encourages us to see as little as possible of the "native"—and so I really know nothing about India except what I pick up when I am out shooting big game; and that's not much, because then one only meets the less intelligent country folk.'

An adjutant of an Indian regiment writes to an Indian paper to say that his English officers are all busy saving up money to pay for their next trip to England, or to pay bills run up on their last visit there. They can get leave to go home to England pretty well as often as they can afford. 'They know nothing of India really in these days, and care less.'

Surely this is asking for disaster!

§ 5. *The Problem of India's Population*

The problem of population in India is a pressing one, and the Government of India has got to make up its mind definitely how it intends to deal with the question. Emigration can at best be only a temporary relief, and it is already beset with difficulties which are likely to increase rather than diminish.

The natural rate of increase, though not high, is, under present circumstances, too great; India has already more inhabitants than the whole of Europe and, apart from the yearly increase of several millions, it is difficult to ensure at present a decent subsistence for the population she already has.

Many factors have operated in the past to prevent the population from increasing too rapidly; though several of these factors are still operating, their tendency to check the natural increase is diminishing. If the means by which the population has been or could be prevented from increasing too fast are considered it will be plain that the only means of preventing a too rapid increase of the population are either increased emigration or birth-control or both. The principal factors or methods that have operated in the past or might operate in the future to prevent any great increase are:

(1) Famine, semi-starvation; the latter often due to over-taxation.

(2) Infanticide; the prohibition of the remarriage of widows; in the hill districts, polyandry; the ill effects of premature pregnancy.

(3) Malaria; plague; cholera and other epidemic and endemic diseases.

(4) Crimes of violence; mortality due to wild beasts and inter-tribal disputes.

(5) Tuberculosis and other industrial or town-bred diseases.

(6) Ignorance causing death in pregnancy and child-birth, and high infant mortality.

(7) Venereal diseases; alcohol; opium; monasticism; other anti-genetic tendencies, perversions, vices, abnormal forms of intercourse.

(8) Attempts to raise the age of marriage and consent.

(9) Emigration.

(10) Birth-control.

Obviously none of the first seven of these groups can be encouraged to operate by any Government that pretended to be civilized. Of the last three, birth-control would be the most efficacious, emigration the simplest, and raising the age of consent would appeal most to those anxious to save the suffering and mortality due to premature maternity.

There are many advocates for raising the age of consent, especially amongst those well-meaning persons to whom 'vice' and 'immorality' only suggests sex-matters, and who desire at all hazards to prevent any possibility of precocious intercourse between immature young men and young women.

It will be just as well to realize the special dangers attendant on attempts to raise the age of consent in a tropical sub-continent like India where the housing conditions and surroundings are generally so bad, and where one is dealing with many different races, some of whom are imaginative, highly-strung and perhaps naturally rather self-indulgent, who have been accustomed from time immemorial to much more liberty in this direction than is permitted in twentieth-century England.

Just as in the questions of the remarriage of widows, polygamy and infant-marriage, any sudden alteration in the direction of raising the age of consent is likely to produce the same chain of undesirable results, indirect or direct. This would be especially the case as regards the latter reform.

We are apt to forget that it is only comparatively recently that the age of consent has been raised in England from fourteen to sixteen—actually it was still legal in England in 1928 to marry a girl of twelve!

Almost certainly any great or sudden alteration in the legal age of marriage or consent would result in an increase of prostitution and illegitimacy, and indirectly in venereal disease. There would also be a greatly increased temptation towards the seduction of married women and undesirable misdemeanours such as rape, incest and unnatural vice, and a certain increase in the commoner forms of perversion amongst young men. All this would largely increase the opportunity for the Indian police to practise persecution and exact blackmail; a reform of the police and their methods would have to be a preliminary step to any real attempts at moral reform.

If the age of consent or marriage was raised, more of the earlier children would survive, and for a time there would be thus a more rapid increase of population, for there would certainly be less maternal mortality.

Sex questions have to be dealt with very cautiously when one is dealing with large numbers of poor, badly-housed and uneducated people. The dangers of applying standards suitable for the English character and climate to the sex problems of Indians are only too obvious, but they are so frequently lost sight of that they cannot be emphasized too often. Many proposals suggest an even higher standard for sex-morals for Indians in India than for Englishmen in England—and with much more rigorous punishments!

Undoubtedly a gradual lifting of the age of consent would, if the other dangers could be avoided, do much good, but, unfortunately, so far from this checking any increase in population, it would be likely to have the opposite effect—for very few children that survive are born as a result of premature intercourse, and the improvement of morale and the elimination of precocity would only increase the potential fertility of the young men and women when mature.

As regards emigration the difficulties are very great and increasing. The objections to Hindu immigrants appear to be irremovable, though they are not always very reasonable or humane; in any case India can scarcely hope to find an inexhaustible dumping ground for her surplus millions.

There remains then only birth-control as a means of checking the tendency towards over-population in India.

The prejudices against this particular means of controlling a danger which grows with every advance in hygiene and civilization are rather difficult to account for. No doubt the general ignorance—even in England—of physiology and biology, and the carefully cultivated mysticism concerning the simple and obvious facts of parentage, can explain some of the hostility to this modern science—a science which promises to solve ultimately so many social, economic and military problems both in India and in Europe.

It is urged that the difficulties that will have to be overcome before the knowledge and practice of birth-control can be diffused in India are insurmountable, but these difficulties can easily be exaggerated. Already more is known about birth-control by certain races in Asia than in many European countries.

The absurdity of waiting for a war, a famine or an earthquake to neutralize Nature's rather wasteful propagation-mania, is becoming evident even to the least progressive nations.

There is one other step that would be comparatively easy to take and which might slightly reduce the rate of increase of population in India, and that is the prohibition of polygamy. Polygamy is not generally practised in India, but where it is it undoubtedly raises the birth-rate, but at the same time reduces the amount of prostitution by absorbing the surplus women.

But the abolition of the prohibition against the remarriage of widows, together with the abolition of polygamy, would flood the market with anything from *ten to twenty more millions of marriageable women!* So here again there would result almost inevitably an increase of prostitution, illegitimacy, infanticide and venereal disease.

There seems to be nothing for it but to accept birth-control as the only solution that does not increase the tendency to further demoralization. Sooner or later birth-control will have to be accepted.

§ 6. *Wine, Women . . . and Clubs*

For a European the food of India is often unappetizing. Stringy beef, gluey vegetables, buffalo's milk in the tea: the fruit indifferent, the fish nearly tasteless, and the water, even when it is drinkable, flat and mawkish!

So it means Drink—generally whisky. Men badly fed even in England take to drink. Physiologically speaking, it is almost inevitable.

But one ' large whisky ' contains as much carbon as a slice of beef, and the temptation after profuse sweating is to take too many of these ' slices of beef '. So there will follow all the signs of over-work of the liver—loss of appetite, irritability, bad temper, and then six months' leave to England with ' hepatic congestion ', officially considered to be due to ' overwork '.

Between five-thirty in the afternoon, when it begins to grow dark, and eight-fifteen, when the Englishman in India is supposed to take his dinner, what is there to do? There is only the club bar for short drinks, or the bridge-room where drinks are rather longer.

With a few Chinese gardeners in each cantonment to take advantage of the unlimited sunshine and the facilities for irrigation there would be plenty of good fruit and vegetables, and a better chance for the Englishman who knows that the best way to keep away from drink in India is to be almost a vegetarian.

Have the increased numbers of white women that have recently gone to India helped or hindered the English garrison to live at peace with the Indian?

Certainly with white women about men drink rather less; or at least there is much less 'soaking'—less solitary drinking.

The white woman's presence, and her tongue, render the keeping of a mistress (white or coloured) by the white man more difficult, if not impossible. So the irregular ménage and the half-caste children of 'Josh Sedley's' day are becoming only a memory. Quite possibly this restriction, which often does not operate equally in England, may increase the unmarried white-man's irritability with things in general.

Yet, outwardly at least, the influence of the white women in India is something to the good. Against this has to be set the fact that since her arrival the white official has become less interested in the native and India generally. The white woman is exacting; she must be amused; so the white man leaves his office still earlier. Society in an Indian Cantonment has become very English—almost suburban—a mixture of Belgravia and Brixton.

The advent of the white woman has had little effect on the lives of the Indians; often she is less interested in Indian life and surroundings than her brothers are. It may be she fears to give any sort of support to the idea, exploited by certain novelists, as to her supposed admiration for the more handsome and warlike of the Indian races.

The white woman in India has many servants and little housework; her children, if she has any, have been sent home to England; and often she is some hundreds of miles from a shopping centre; so there is little else to kill the time before her next trip to England but tennis and racing, bridge and cocktails, dancing and scandal, and moonlight motor rides with unattached young Englishmen. In the hot weather she leaves her husband on the plains; in some gay hill-station she will find dance partners even more ardent than those she has left behind. There is not much in her life in India to bring out what is best in her.

So her character is inclined to harden and coarsen. Gallantly she tries to retain ‘ that school-girl complexion ’; she has more success in acquiring very often ‘ that school-boy rudeness ’. On occasion she can treat the ‘ native ’ more insolently than her husband does. When she imitates men she can be ‘ more royal than the King ’, and even fan racial dislike into a flame with her complaints. Some native has dared to argue the point with her, given notice to leave her service, or been ‘ cheeky ’, so he must be thrashed. It is not her fault that she has been removed from the moralizing influence of work and responsibility. If India is not a white man's country, it is still less a white woman's.

If she fails to rise superior to her surroundings she is not to blame, for her health deteriorates; and then her temper as fast as her complexion. Her morale can scarcely be improved by a life of pleasure and idleness. She is in a minority, and so much sought after; though, apart from her sex allure, she may have but few attractive moral or physical qualities after some years in India.

The unmarried Englishman in India, if he dare not any longer keep a native mistress, can at least do worse; he can flirt with his brother officers' wives, or dangerously resort to native prostitutes—the climate and the surroundings do not make for chastity. From the prostitute he learns nothing; from his old time Hindu mistress he learnt at least the language, and obtained an intimate knowledge of Indian life and traditions—she saved many mutinies.

It is so easy for the white woman to learn to be exacting in India. Living in the same small circle, her husband's Juniors can, to all intents and purposes, be ' ordered ' to dance or play golf with her, and to attend her dinner-parties. Her displeasure may affect their prospects. She can ' interfere ' with discipline—and she does!

If she liked she could do so much to ameliorate conditions in India; with her instinctive sympathy for Indian women and their troubles she could be a link between the two races. But in nine cases out of ten she rather helps to widen the gulf between white and brown; she alienates her husband still more from his work, for she soon begins to complain and to pine for Europe—where at least she felt well.

Thanks to her presence the mixture of races in India has been diminished. Yet the Eurasians, with all their faults, might in time have formed a kind of bridge. If the white and the brown, the yellow and the black men are ever to live at peace, either one group must be exterminated, or admixture must take place. But the bastard and neglected half-caste offspring of ‘ forgetful ’ soldiers and traders was a bad solution.

Whatever benefit the white woman’s presence has been, she has unwittingly brought the loss of India a stage nearer. The Englishman in India has his eyes now always upon Europe—more than ever now we are but birds of passage.

The Indian Club is the centre of English life in India. Generally it has a majority of military or official members. With the Army officers and Indian civilians there may be a sprinkling of English business men—box-wallahs as they are called—and perhaps one or more of the local rajahs as honorary but not very welcome members.

Uniforms are seen all day on the verandahs, military bands play regularly in the afternoons by the tennis courts. It is the centre for all sports and social activities; for card parties and dances. There the Sahib and his wife find the circulating library, the swimming bath and the store for European delicacies. In the ladies' wing the officers' wives play cards, drink cocktails and talk scandal. Membership for all well-to-do white people is a necessity, almost an obligation. Blocks of quarters are provided for bachelors and for married members. It is a residential club that is half a regimental anteroom.

It is at the club that reputations are made—or broken—usually broken; that the latest news about big game shooting and race-meetings and the forthcoming military manœuvres can be obtained; where the latest *risqué* stories are repeated, and the latest quips heard concerning the 'absurd idea of pretending we are going to give the Indians self-government'.

Much of the hostility towards 'natives' is worked up at the club bar over the rounds of mixed Vermouth or champagne cocktails.

Out of the fullness of the heart—and the glass—the mouth speaketh. The conversation may be toned down when a senior official comes in, unless he also is known to suffer from negro-phobia. Quite often he has that disease all the worse because during office hours he has had to suppress it.

It is the club bar that decides that unpopular members and pro-natives *are* unpopular; where the latest sallies against the League of Nations and Liberalism and the Socialists can be heard, and where the Oriental equivalents of obscene epithets in Anglo-Saxon are applied to the 'nigger' with genuine feeling.

Yet without that rendezvous at the club bar life in India would be more monotonous and even less supportable than it is.

India is not a white man's country.

§ 7. *Divide and Rule*

Whenever suggestions have been made by Irishmen or Indians that we Englishmen are in the habit of favouring Mohammedans against Hindus, or Irish Protestants at the expense of Irish Catholics, we indignantly deny such diabolical tactics. With our hand on our heart we assure the world at large that we deplore the quarrels in India between Hindus and Mohammedans. And yet whenever Hindus and Mohammedans grow friendly with each other our politicians and publicists begin to be gloomy.

Recently one of the principal Conservative newspapers published an article which was signed by a peer who had been a Lieutenant-Governor of a great Indian Province. In this article, speaking of the English Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the writer unblushingly admits that he (Lord Curzon) 'confidently counted on our diplomatic ability to keep the other Great Powers quarrelling among themselves'! Could Lenin, Trotsky, Mr. de Valera, or Mr. Gandhi or even the German Emperor have said anything more damning?

The article was gleefully appreciated on the Continent of Europe. The English were at last going to give up being hypocrites, they were instead—modern war being so ghastly—going to be merely open and confessed mischief-makers and rascals.

No doubt copies of this great newspaper have long since reached India, where there are many Indians now who can read English.

The greater is supposed invariably to include the less. It would be difficult to persuade an Indian or any other foreigner with this newspaper in front of him that we should be too high-minded to connive at encouraging indirectly the hostility and jealousy between Hindus and Mohammedans in order to provide, for the benefit of the world at large, a plausible reason for our remaining indefinitely in India. Would the chief of the Indian Secret Service or Political Service be able truthfully to deny that his Department has never used or condoned the use of *agents-provocateurs*, and that he had never followed Lord Curzon's example and ' kept others quarrelling ' ?

We took the slave-owners' side during the American Civil War; the Aristocrats' side during the French and Russian Revolutions. Have we done nothing to support or to hinder either directly or indirectly one side or the other during the present disputes in India and in China? These questions must occur to anyone after reading the plain statement, almost a boast, regarding the late Lord Curzon and his alleged Machiavellian tactics in Europe.

A small and weak country, or a weak individual, may be driven by its very helplessness to break the rules that a stronger power should find it easy to keep, to use guile and cunning to match the superior resources and physical strength of its antagonist. But what need can there be for a country as strong as England, the head of a vast Empire, or rather of a Commonwealth which is as strong and as generally well-intentioned as the British Commonwealth undoubtedly is, to sink to these mean and underhand tricks and mischief-making devices? Considering what modern war means, and that dishonesty whether in Asia or in Europe must in the end lead to war, is not the play on the rivalry and jealousy of other races an inexcusable and unforgivable crime?

What is the use of being strong and rich if even then you dare not be honest?

CHAPTER FIVE

SEX AND SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS

THE BEAM AND THE MOTE

§ 1

EVEN if the continence and morals of an average Englishman or other European could be proved to be better than those of an Indian of the corresponding class, we should still have little reason to boast of our superiority. Europeans can indulge in innumerable sports, games and other amusements which provide outlets for our surplus energy. For nearly all of these the Indian generally has neither the leisure nor the money, nor does the climate or his meagre vegetarian diet give him the zest necessary for most of our outdoor games.

Not only do our colder climate and other circumstances combine to make continence more easy, but for those who may be more sensuously inclined, there are other distractions available. We can enjoy a richer and more varied diet. We can afford the Arts of Music and Literature and private and public entertainments. With the diversion of sports and games and these other distractions available, intellectual or sensuous, and with less imagination to provoke us, we have far less excuse for resorting to that other form of sensuality, excitement and gratification which is provided by nature and which we call sex interest; and yet, are we individually so much better in our thoughts and our ' sex morality ' than the Indian?

The majority of Indians cannot read, and even when they do, are for the most part quite unable to afford the cost of books and newspapers. For the most part the Indian can only occupy his mind with the trivial circumstance of his daily labour, and the gossip and scandal of his village. In the cold weather he and his fellows crouch shivering before a fire of dried cow-dung. In the hot weather he pants and perspires in the sultry evenings beside the village well. Always he talks of his scanty wages, of the rising prices of food, of the plague and the fever, and, of course, like us, of women and intrigue and all 'uncleanness'. He is, in fact, very human. But it is surely an impertinence to accuse these folk of greater immorality than their more prosperous brethren in Europe, whose average conversation, in spite of their advantages, is not so much more intellectual, and to whom village or city scandal is just as succulent.

It may be unfortunate, but it happens to be the case that sex indulgence is the one form of gratification which costs nothing and so is available to the pauper and to the uneducated the wide world over ; and India is full of paupers. It is Pharisaical for the well-to-do classes—the more prosperous nations—to rebuke their poorer brethren for indulging in the only form of distraction which their circumstances permit. We know how necessary it is, even for us and in our colder climate, to provide innumerable distractions for our well-to-do young people, lest eroticism take complete possession of them.

When the censorious outsider has been not only bred in a colder climate, but is able to afford many other distractions, and is, too, an alien who has not only imposed his rule by force, but attempts to impose alien standards of morals and his materialistic philosophy, it is not surprising that his censoriousness only irritates and does more harm than good.

The Soul is a living organism that can only grow, as do all other things, by a process of trial and error, learning most, perhaps, from its errors; and the soul of a nation, as of an individual, needs the air of liberty—the greatest freedom possible—for its healthy growth. All we can do for the Indian, if we are to remain as his Governor, is to free him as far as possible from his economic servitude, educate him to appreciate the advantages of hygiene and good order, and leave him to grow up—a process in our own case, when we consider our criminal statistics, which is by no means yet complete. We English have scarcely shed yet our youthful intolerance and our puerile contempt for ‘ foreigners ’.

Those of us who remember the propaganda that was poured forth concerning the private immorality of the Boer farmers before we made war on them, the accusations of inordinate vice made against the Chinese and Russians, when we launched our expeditions against these countries already hampered by their internal troubles, and our more recent reckless and, admittedly, largely untrue, German propaganda, must be on their guard when the same stream of exaggeration and calumny begins to flow against the wretched Indian, because he has at last kicked against the exploitation and the insult of which he has been the helpless victim. It is too common and obvious a trick to begin to impugn the moral character of those to whom you are determined to refuse justice, or whom you intend later to rob, to circumvent, subjugate or destroy.

We who knew Ireland before her emancipation cannot fail to note the difference now. Subjection had produced vindictive hatred and little else; but now the degraded fatalism, the absence of effort, the bitter religious quarrels, are rapidly disappearing in the air of freedom. There arises from prolonged frustration of national spirit and cultural development an onanism of the soul which is far more demoralizing than any solitary indulgence of the body; and all races in subjection, denied their independence and their culture, suffer obviously from this dread malady. The Master Gardener likes variety in his garden. It is better for the soil and it is better for the plants that one aggressive type should not over-run the earth.

§ 2

Of course—amongst 320 millions of people—much ‘immorality’ exists in India—as elsewhere—and may affect the stamina of the races concerned, but it is too easy to exaggerate both the extent of these failings and their evil results.

As a proof that it is not only necessary for us to remain as the censorious task-masters of the Indians but also to adopt a severely contemptuous and repressive attitude towards a race addicted to so much 'wickedness', it is often asserted that the Indian's feebleness of physique and intellectual backwardness are due to his addiction to 'immorality' of every kind. It is for his benefit, one is told, that we should dragoon him from his lascivious habits which produce so much degeneracy of body and mind. It is assumed that his weaknesses are mainly due to his sexual immorality. Anyone who knows the real conditions under which the average Indian has to exist, must be aware that there are a host of other causes, any two or three of which would be quite sufficient to account for the weakness, smallness of stature, mental inertia and feebleness of character that are common in India.

Miss Mayo's assumption in her books that 'youthful depravity' is necessarily responsible for the Indian's physical degeneracy is not only part of a time-worn fallacy—but it proves too much. She would have been much nearer the truth if she had reversed her suggestion. Degeneracy is more the cause of misbehaviour—than the result. It is well-known that degenerate and cretinoid types are liable from quite early infancy to forms of depravity, but that is not to say that these infantile misdemeanours cause the degeneracy—it would even be very difficult to prove that they aggravated the condition.

Most people are well aware that children, even of good parentage, who are subjected to too much stress and anxiety in their early years, often grow up more or less abnormal or degenerate. This is especially true of such adverse circumstances as terror, mental or physical bullying, semi-starvation or when they are subjected to cruelty in any form or brought up in unhealthy surroundings, and it may even be true, should they suffer severely from sleepy-sickness, malaria, congenital syphilis, meningitis and other diseases. All parents are aware that children who have suffered from any long-standing debility or chronic illness are apt to become in many ways demoralized—partly because these conditions keep the ailing child too much alone with its thoughts and its body at a time when nature is very busy with its small anatomy. If ‘ it is not good for man to be alone ’, it certainly is not always a very good thing for children.

These degenerate types—however and whenever the degeneracy may have been caused—often show a great lack of control in all directions, including a marked tendency to excess in alcohol, to have uncontrollable fits of anger and to practise self-abuse, with the other evidences of an unstable nervous system.

Now, a great many of the adverse conditions just mentioned are normally in operation on the Indian child, who is lucky if it does not suffer at least from chronic malaria, intermittent dysentery and semi-starvation, besides the debilitating defects of overcrowding in a tropical climate.

‘ Youthful depravity! ’—what a terrifying and high-sounding name for an almost universal tendency. Of course, these failings are present in India, but this aspect of India's morals has been shamelessly exaggerated. But an accusation of inordinate vice is, of course, a ' best-seller '.

Childish want of control, boyish curiosity and youthful incontinence is, in all its forms, in all probability very common in India, as, indeed, observant medical men and priests know it to be in all other countries, not excepting France or England, Italy or America. Nations whose troops have dominated the world, as did Napoleon's and Cæsar's, were riddled with every form of what is called ' vice and perversion '.

In the armies of Turkey and Afghanistan it is true that abstinence from alcohol was the rule, but there was no sort of attempt at sexual continence and this virtue was, and probably is still, all but absent in the armies of France and Germany. The writer's recollections of his pre-war service as a private soldier in British barracks are not such as could be fully published ; yet the Afghan and the German, the Turk and the English, depraved and degenerate as Miss Mayo may think them, are almost irresistible in war and extremely tough customers in peace.

It is difficult to speak the whole truth about these matters because when you tell the truth to a sentimentalist, he or she will be only too ready to accuse you of encouraging, minimizing, or defending vice. But it is because we have so many sentimentalists who will not face the truth that our morals and our politics, our economics and our social conditions, are getting everywhere into such chaos.

Naturally any habit, if indulged in to excess, or persisted in, can do or may do *some* harm, and sensual indulgences, sexual or otherwise, are, of course, no exception; but they stand in no especially dangerous category—indeed from the ‘ Puritan ’ point of view, it may be regretted that in themselves, apart from their concomitants, these habits in most cases do such comparatively little harm.

As a matter of daily experience, it is far easier to injure the health with drugs, late hours, alcohol, irregular meals, excess of tobacco, mental anxiety and foul air, than it is to do so by over-indulging that appetite which called us into being—and this is unfortunately true whether the indulgence be in solitary vice, which is probably the most detrimental, or in any other fashion, orthodox or unorthodox, that is at all commonly practised. What the moralists and the puritans must get into their heads is that it is not the indulgence of this appetite that does any peculiar physical harm, but rather its concomitants. It happens that sexual dissipation is usually associated with late hours, loss of sleep, drink, coarse companionage, irregular meals, gambling, and other excitements and, perhaps, with sleeping in close, ill-ventilated rooms in some unwholesome rendezvous reeking with tobacco smoke. To these must be added the worries of paying for the dissipation, the fear of being robbed or blackmailed and the fear of contracting some venereal disease which, if caught, is harder to cure in alcoholics or in those suffering from lack of sleep or mental worry. It is these unwholesome concomitants that do most, if not all, of the mischief to the body and to the mind and, perhaps, if we only knew it, to the soul—for the soul, whether of a man or a woman, does not live, as some zealous Puritans and Christians evidently believe, exclusively in one or other of our mucous membranes, if, indeed, it inhabits them at all. A man's soul and a woman's, too, can probably be more completely corroded and destroyed by injustice, brutality, loneliness and ill-temper than by indulgences in food, drink or sex, or any other form of pleasure which the individual finds stimulating.

If Miss Mayo were right, the Turks, the French, the Germans and the Spaniards, and—dare one say it?—the English, too, would be some of the most undersized and degenerate races in the world. Like other well-meaning folk, with the sexual bee in their bonnet, she has put the Indian cart before the horse—a tendency to excess is the mark, not the *cause* of a lowered *morale*. It is the stigma of an inferior nervous system or of some hereditary predisposition. This is not to say that the want of control, the craving for stimulation to neutralize some deficiency may not increase the very deficiency from which it arose, and that degenerate habits may increase degeneracy—but we are not, in sex matters, yet quite sure even of this. If the vicious circle does indeed complete itself by increasing its own vicious cause, then the individual and his stock so affected will, in conformance with Nature's intentions, remove themselves and their diseased inheritance, in course of time, from a planet on which they are a source of anxiety and expense.

Miss Mayo is, of course, not the first to fall into this obvious trap of supposing the *symptoms* of degeneracy or instability to be the *cause*. In England, at least, we can trace the origin of many of these false assumptions to the ineptitudes which are rammed into our heads at our Public Schools. It is common in England for schoolmasters and others in charge of the young, who habitually base such assumptions on sentiment and hearsay, to enormously exaggerate the ill-effects of ‘ misbehaviour ’. It is done with the intention of ‘ frightening ’ their audiences and discouraging tendencies common during puberty and adolescence to young males and to many females. Though well-intentioned, it is, in the long run and all things considered, a very ill-advised method. It is probably always better to tell the real truth in these matters without exaggeration. Doctors and others in a position to know, agree that not only is the effect on the general health much less than used to be supposed, but that bad habits are not so much the cause of abnormal weakness and irritability but rather only one of a group of symptoms that disclose a neurotic temperament, usually traceable to a neurotic ancestry or to some special stress in childhood. Lack of self-control is not then the cause of physical weakness and temperamental instability but one of the many manifestations of that temperament and its associated disabilities, mental and physical. In short, neurosis and nervous instability are more often the cause of misbehaviour than one of its effects. And an ' anxiety '-complex often begins the neurosis.

Obviously, it is not possible to decide just how much the fact that many of the inhabitants of the Indian Peninsula are weak or neurotic, under-sized, unintelligent or feeble-minded is due to chronic under-feeding which amounts to semi-starvation, combined with the debilitating effects of malarial poison, both continued through many generations. Again, how much of this feebleness may also be due to overcrowding, want of education and sanitation, insufficient clothing in the cold season and the enervating effects of a very trying hot season, and the constant ravages of dysentery and other endemic tropical diseases which drain the system of all vigour? Just how much of the residue of physical and mental inefficiency may be due to various forms of immorality and lascivious behaviour or to racial causes not yet investigated, it is impossible to estimate.

Certainly it begs the whole question to claim that misbehaviour during puberty, or the effects of marriage at an 'age' when many of our own Plantagenet princesses were married—now considered in Europe to be too early—can be held mainly or even largely responsible for differences of physique and a lower standard of average efficiency in India! Apart from all these other possible causes of feebleness, the meagre vegetarian diet of the bulk of the Indian races might itself alone account for their comparative weakness, for this diet is often, owing to the scarcity of fuel—cow-dung has to be used as fuel in many parts of India—insufficiently cooked before it is eaten.

There are also certain facts that discredit the assumption that the failings of the Indians are due to the alleged exceptional lasciviousness and not to the climate and other causes. The most stalwart of English or Scotch immigrants tend, however well-behaved, within a generation or two of continuous residence in India, either to rapidly degenerate physically and mentally, or to die out altogether.

Another significant fact is that the Pathan, one of the tallest and most handsome and vigorous of the races of India, is, generally speaking, far more immoral than the undersized Bengali or Southern Indian. There can scarcely be in the whole world a race more addicted from boyhood to indulgence in various forms of sexual gratification than the Pathan; yet it is difficult to find in these six-foot specimens of hardy manhood any sign of degeneracy, physical or mental. Agile, supple, brave as lions, strong, fleet of foot, and—when they choose—faithful unto death, the Pathan is one of the few men the English soldier would prefer not to meet in hand-to-hand combat. 'Immoral' though they be—they are fit, because, unlike most Indians, they have a healthier and more rigorous climate and a meat diet.

We must then give up our cherished ideas that persons, be they brown or white, who are physically weaker than ourselves or mentally less acute, are so mainly because they are more 'vicious' or more 'wicked' than we are.

Such an idea may be useful as propaganda when we wish to salve our consciences for having subjugated or exploited a race weaker than ourselves, but it has little foundation in fact. But when an individual has either superfluous nervous energy or physical strength he will usually dissipate the excess in some form of enjoyment or indulgence; if deficient in any way he will crave for that form of stimulation which temporarily makes good his deficiency.

We may abuse and despise the weaker races. They are usually under-fed and therefore not likely to be capable of inordinate wickedness and immorality. We should look for this with more reason among the better-fed and more vigorous of the meat-eating and Northern races—we might actually find the Beam to be, after all, in our own eye!

§ 3

There are other considerations which we must bear in mind before we hastily condemn the Indians to political subjection for moral reasons.

Many youthful addicts to alcoholism suffer from either an abnormally low blood-pressure or from insomnia due to excessive mental activity. In such cases the craving would seem to be dictated by some physiological necessity, a desire to relieve both of these conditions. In much the same way a deficiency of the Internal Sex-secretion—that is so essential, particularly during growth, for the development of brain and body—will automatically and instinctively suggest some methods of compensation. Such a deficiency may be due to 'anxiety', under-feeding or other adverse conditions, some of which, like 'fear', are known to reduce the supply of blood to the organs concerned. One way of rectification would be to increase the supply of blood to these organs by some undesirable form of autogenous stimulation.

The demoralization of children and nations who have been subjected to 'terror' is a recognized fact. Terror may take many forms; bullying, mental or physical, and many other forms of stress on the young have much the same effect in producing an 'anxiety' which, in turn, constricts the blood-vessels and diminishes some of the most essential of the internal secretions. Not only bullying and severity of discipline, but, in civilized countries, 'examination anxiety' and intellectual 'over-work' may have the same psychological and physical effect on an individual as tyranny does at school or a hectoring sergeant-major on a young soldier. Certainly one need not suppose that all the youthful depravity common amongst English or Indian school-boys and young soldiers can be traced to some instinctive craving for a secretion diminished by bullying and other stresses. But prolonged periods of fear or privation do undoubtedly have demoralizing effects on the controlling mechanism, including sex-control. How many young men who suffered prolonged periods of 'fear' during the war came back with anything like the same amount of sexual continence they went out with? The change in many characters was so marked that it could have scarcely been due entirely to the squalor and uncertainty of war.

It is also to be remembered that in addition to this possibility there is the fact that the more highly-strung and imaginative races and individuals will not only be more affected by ‘ anxiety ’ but will be more troubled with ‘ sex images ’ and lascivious dreams and the other phenomena of developing sex. The fact that it is so often the more imaginative and intelligent of young people who are the most ‘ sinful ’ is easily accounted for; the more intelligent are also more likely to see through the pretences of their elders and to notice how seldom what is preached by their governors is practised by them. It is recognized that children and others who suffer from an ‘ anxiety ’-complex should not be subjected to too much schooling or to a strict discipline—running wild does them good.

It is doubtful if sex-misconduct is ever due entirely to premeditated wickedness. Sleeplessness caused by sex growth and the mental disturbances due partly to school lessons and partly to sex may easily increase the temptation to some form of indulgence that is soporific.

The young Indian is no more free from ‘ anxiety ’ than his much more fortunate fellow-subject in England. Indeed, on the average he must suffer far too often from inhibiting influences on his sex and growth. Semi-starvation affects the great bulk of the children in India. Life in the villages of India for a hundred reasons is precarious and dangerous. There are no lights in the village and no sort of safety in the jungle around for a child—in many cases even by day. Malaria and sleeping-sickness and a dozen other diseases have a definitely demoralizing as well as a devitalizing effect. If he grows up diminutive in stature and addicted more than his English brother to bouts of lasciviousness the explanation of both phenomena is not far to seek. To pretend that his conduct and that of his elders is a proof that they are also politically incompetent and unfit for freedom is surely to use the disadvantages of his situation as an excuse for imposing other disadvantages.

There are many reasons against war and many more against the bullying and ill-treatment of young people and against tyranny and cruelty anywhere, but there would appear to be still another deep psychological and physiological objection to ruling by fear and to inducing in whatever form or by whatever means an 'anxiety'-complex in others. In doing so we demoralize them in ways we have not suspected, and many a cringing child who is thrashed in the nursery for indecency, and many a whining boy who is flogged at Borstal or in some Reformatory School for habits themselves originating in previous terror and ill-treatment, or because of some hereditary taint, are there as witnesses. We have, amongst our governing classes, men always in a hurry to use the lash whether in England or in India. They were hardened at school—and they forget—forget Rehoboam who, with his lash, created two thousand years ago a mutiny in Israel that is not yet healed. They forget the odious significance of the fact that whips are frequently found in prostitutes' houses, and above all they are in a hurry to flog for the very offences and in the very cases in which cruelty and fear and the mutilation of the body of the victim would aggravate and not reduce the tendency to depravity and abnormality. They are in a hurry to part healthy men from their wives and send them to prison where, as every gaoler knows, onanism for men deprived of a natural outlet to which they are accustomed, must and does flourish exceedingly. For this reason alone, in many cases a prisoner is likely to leave prison—morally speaking—worse than he entered it.

Those of us who have witnessed public floggings know what the obscene and evil aftermath of these sadistic exhibitions can be upon both the participators and the spectators—yet there are hot-heads who would like to govern India—and England, too—with the lash and the terror of the machine-gun and the hangman.

An officer sends the writer an account of our doings in Arabia—the flogging of Arab men—naked—before a crowd. The obscene 'sex-stimulation' of the victims at each stroke of the lash—the jeers of the crowd. And we have gone 'to moralize' Asia! Shall we dare to look that Pharisee in the face when we meet him?

A comparison between the moral standards of different races and nations and between the merits of rival religions never produces much more than ill-temper and abuse unless it be conducted by an impartial outsider who has no particular sympathy for the persons and systems under discussion. There has been lately an epidemic of denunciation concerning things Indian in which the words 'depravity,' 'degradation' and 'decadence' have been hurled against the Indians, just as a year or two ago they were being hurled by the professional grumblers and prudes at the youth of their own countries—England and America.

Some thirty or forty years ago the writer was considered adventurous because he rode a high bicycle and occasionally an untrained horse. The youth of his day were principally occupied in drinking, attending music-halls and getting into what were known as 'scrapes', usually concerning betting, wine, women, or venereal disease. They were certainly fouler-mouthed and less cleanly in their habits than our modern youth; they were two inches shorter and their complexions and their teeth were not their strong point. Yet we are asked to believe that the modern clerk or working lad who thinks nothing of risking his neck at sixty miles an hour on the highway or at a hundred miles an hour in an aeroplane, is a decadent degenerate from the high standards of the middle-aged persons who now criticize them! And the Indian youth? Miss Mayo's admirers would have us believe that they also are decadent and immoral! Twenty-five years ago when the cumulative effect of Mr. Kipling's 'Imperialism' and our bungling in India was beginning to show itself, there was trouble in Bengal, and the youth of Bengal—as youth, if it is worth its salt, always will be—were in the forefront of the battle. Some of these youths were shot and flogged by the British authorities or condemned, after having been bludgeoned by the police, to the prolonged torture of an Indian prison or to transportation to the Andaman Islands. Moved by an exhibition of heroism on the part of two of these youths, who were little more than schoolboys, one great newspaper in India—an English Conservative paper—and a Government organ—compared the heroism of these two youths to that of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, the boy-heroes of a Greek story of patriotism. But where twenty-five years ago there were but two or two hundred of these young ‘ hooligans ’ as our governing classes would call them—‘ martyrs ’ as their countrymen would think them—they can now be counted in hundreds and in hundreds of thousands, perhaps even in millions. Little more than children, they are yet ready to face bludgeoning by the police and the bullets of a second Amritsar, long terms of imprisonment and death in order that they may free their country from what they consider an alien culture and an unsympathetic, brutal and not too scrupulous Government. They may be mistaken—they may exaggerate, it may be that they suffer from an excess of zeal or a too sentimental attachment to Golden Bengal, and to Mother Ganges; that they shout ‘ Bande Mataram! ’ too often and too aggressively; but at least they show a self-sacrifice and a devotion to their country which is still considered admirable in Europe. A willingness to face death for an ideal is, Miss Mayo's admirers must agree, a very peculiar form of 'decadence', a more than uncommon form of 'degeneracy'. We should have to fall back on the hackneyed explanation that an action considered patriotic for an Englishman in England becomes degeneracy or hysteria or rank sedition when it is practised or risked by a Bengali in Bengal!

It is said that many German women are refusing to have children—'refuse to bring slaves into the world'—and that such of the German youth who survived the terrors of the war and such of those in the nursery who survived the starvation blockade of the British Fleet are largely degenerate. All things considered it would be very peculiar if they were not, having, amongst other things, when already 'war-shocked', to face eighty years of economic slavery in order to pay for the Great War for which they honestly believe themselves to be unjustly accused of the sole responsibility. As the majority of them were in the nursery at the outbreak of war, the pretence that they, as individuals, can in any way be held responsible and should therefore be made to suffer, can hardly carry conviction even to those who profess to think so. Were the accusations true that are made against the youth of Modern England—the writer does not think they are true—the fact that these young people also grew up during the war period might explain their alleged nervous instability and depravity.

Our aeroplanes bomb Arab villages and the dwelling-places of the Pathans and the Kachins and other races with wonderful efficiency and regularity. If we only killed all the people we bomb and they were killed instantly it would perhaps not matter very much—for the fecundity of the human race is almost terrifying. But what, of course, does happen is that we injure and terrorize large numbers of children and pregnant women and induce that state of 'anxiety' which can be such a fruitful source of psychological mischief. Having subjected these 'rebellious foreigners' to this demoralizing influence we afterwards send missionaries and police-commissioners to rebuke them for their immorality! The spectacle of nations that pride themselves on their moralizing influence trying to increase 'loyalty' and improve 'morals' by using one of the most demoralizing of agencies, would be humorous if it were not so pitiable and futile. Even the most primitive of communities have a certain amount of self-respect, and the really damnable thing about attempting to govern by terror and not by appeal to reason is that those who are humiliated with fear lose not only their self-respect but their respect for humanity and for one another. There are some things that those who have experienced them try to forget, and one of them is the utter demoralization that takes place in prisoners' camps, not excluding those which held British officers and men captured by the Boers in the Boer War and by the Germans in the late war—it does not therefore need much imagination to realize that the same demoralization takes place whenever a sense of captivity, a feeling of restraint under terror, is felt either by individuals or by nations.

But, reason apart, there remains a certain prevalent type of Englishman of the governing class who have a craving to impose their opinion upon others. His own countrymen, being often somewhat obstinate, this type finds it easier to inflict its rule and opinion upon coloured folk. They call this craving for interference their ' Heaven-sent mission '—or a ' Gift for Governing '—a very useful reassurance for busybodies and well-paid officials to have. This type, amongst other things, suffers from an almost pathological sex-complex. They would force upon a world, already sufficiently troubled with economic problems and a rapidly increasing population, the burden of their own pathology—a peculiar false shame and horror of sex and a marked tendency to exaggerate both the attractiveness of this appetite and the effects, physical and moral, that result from its satisfaction. This attitude not only poisons their thoughts, but influences their policy and outlook on matters that have little or no connection with sex. These people, who are often influential, will talk and act as if themselves obsessed by a sex-demon! They misunderstand completely Christian teaching—it was the harlot who was forgiven and the Pharisee who was damned forever—they hasten to forget this significant fact! It is in consequence of this perversion that tempers deteriorate and we are always ready to restrict the liberty of other folk on the pretext of preserving their 'sex morality'. It is our own queer, morbid and rather furtive standard of 'sex morality' born of an extravagant attitude of suspicion toward a natural, necessary and by no means anti-social appetite that needs attention—not the other man's. The mutual attraction we call sex provides at least some cement for a society now torn asunder by greed and competition. Why cannot these good folk agree to live and let live, and give their 'Empire' a chance of not being always associated with unscrupulous exploitation or censorious repression? The Bolshevists are much less likely to break up our Empire than the prigs and the martinets.

To deny that India's main problems are sex problems is not to say that a sex problem does not exist there. In barren or over-populated countries this problem is likely to exist in aggravated forms. In such countries especially, whether Asiatic or European, it would seem that unhappy or unwilling mothers tend to bear a higher percentage than usual of children biased towards what we call 'inversion' or sex perversion. Some day perhaps we shall understand just why and how this comes about, and find the remedy, if any, for this tendency, which usually, in indirect ways, discovers itself in early childhood. Meanwhile we must be patient to observe, and not in too great a hurry to denounce that which at present we do not in the least understand.

It is not so very long since the Rulers of England were busy flogging our lunatics!—'To make them better!' A recent English Home Secretary was apparently in favour of flogging and punishing the sex inverted—with, no doubt, the same pious hope concerning their ‘improvement’, and with about the same amount of reason and justification. When his admirers return to office, will they recommend the flogging of those children who, after a severe attack of sleeping-sickness, become morbidly querulous, perverse and intractable? One wonders when this type of Englishman will consent to lay down his whip and begin to learn. We have been one hundred and seventy years in India and seem to have learnt little except how to get ourselves thoroughly disliked and to imitate the shoddy seventeenth century statecraft of some of the Moghul rulers of India.

A few months ago in the English House of Commons there was held a debate concerning the justice and propriety of shooting young men who had been compelled to fight and whose nerves were shaken because they showed ‘cowardice’ in the face of the enemy. The idea of ‘cowardice’ before a creeping barrage of 8-inch shells is itself deliciously humorous. One English Member of Parliament, a High-Churchman and a Conservative, but morally speaking head and shoulders above many of his fellow-members of the ruling class, while supporting the executions, astonished his party by admitting, in measured terms, that, all things considered, he was not at all sure that ‘anybody *deserved* anything’. This Member must surely in that case approve of the hateful slogan attributed to the German Kaiser’s entourage that ‘necessity knows no law’—whether in Belgium or in India or in British courts-martial.

An American, with Puritan zeal, attacks the Hindu religion because it is, she thinks, too much mixed up with sex—it has too much in it of sexual symbolism. Certainly in some of the more crude sectarian beliefs and ritual included in that great mass of religious philosophy which we call Hinduism, the sex element is very obvious, and the Phallic emblems seem very obtrusive to our European eyes. To anyone who has a horror of sex in all its manifestation, and imagines, as do many English, that religion and sex are, or should be, as the poles apart, this sexual element and these symbols may be distressing, obnoxious and even 'disgusting'.

It is, however, only comparatively recently in human history that sex and religion have been so definitely divorced, with results to both sex and religion in Europe and America that can hardly be called entirely satisfactory.

Whether judicially separated or divorced, religion separated from sex becomes gradually divorced from life and reality. Religion now lives in adulterous union with a philosophy that steadily undermines and a police system that supplants it. The plain-clothes detective has, in fact, replaced the God of Righteousness and fair dealing—how effectually remains to be seen!

And sex, divorced from religion, hides furtively behind a gaudy curtain of commercialized lust and exhibitionism. Is New York in sex matters so much better than Benares?

The Puritans—those gloomy, sex-obsessed kill-joys of another age—cut down in England our village

Maypoles. It was monstrous, they said, that the maidens of England should twine garlands round a symbol that had apparently originated in the Priapus of Pan! Away with such obscenity! Besides, those laughing milkmaids, who knew nothing of origins, and cared even less, were being outrageously happy—itself a suspicious sign. To the Puritan mind when other folk are very happy, they are almost certainly in mischief or about to be very 'wicked'.

And the English Puritan has been so busy 'taking notes' in India, though one must be observant indeed to find much or frequent happiness to curtail in that country. As in England and Europe, the country-folk and many townspeople celebrate at about our Easter time—the vernal equinox—a festival, the Saturnalia of Holy. It is then that one sees the lower classes, who do not often laugh, making merry, and apparently happy. The coloured water they throw during the Holy Festival is, some Puritan has discovered, intended to symbolize the Menses of our Mother Earth, about to be fructified in the Spring-time by the radiant Sun, so that the Bread of Life may grow in her womb—the corn may burst forth from its dark tomb in the waiting furrows of the field. Apollo descends again to his marriage-bed—the annual union of the Sun with the Earth. How disgusting! Away with all such festivals—better gloom and sweated labour than such irreligious jollity!

Good folk, so busy reforming other people's religion, often know so little of their own. They have never realized that some of the motions and gestures, the signs and symbols, and even some of the ornaments and rubrics of European Church services, are considered to have had a Phallic origin. Unavoidably so, because the primitive human mind cannot entirely disconnect physical life and its mode of transmission from the idea of the reception of spiritual life and the life to come.

Such an association of ideas—however distressing to prim and prudish folk—does and must exist. Even the most eminent of Christian teachers cannot refrain from using a sex symbolism in their discourses. They make many references to the Marriage of Christ to His Church, to the Divine Seed, to bringing forth good works after being filled with the Holy Spirit of Life, and the like, which even the most unsophisticated can see are analogies to the physical processes of procreation. This being the case, it is unreasonable to find ‘ filth ’ in Indian and other religions because the association of ideas shows itself in a more direct symbolism or in much more concrete forms.

In Miss Mayo’s denunciation and in the attitude of the older generation of English officials, whether in England or in India, we can discern the backwash of those mistaken ideas concerning sex—that false shame—that was so typically Victorian. The minds of most of our Indian administrators are still floundering amidst the squalid misunderstandings of 1880. It is another of their schoolboy complexes, for in their school days the boy was taught, and even still is in some cases, that sex is ‘ filth ’. It is not long before he learns with certainty that his appearance in the world was intimately connected with what he believes to be the least reputable part of his mother's body! There is apparently something insanitary about his arrival in the world, and something equally insanitary about a great many of his thoughts, and one of the principal functions of his own body! He is then ' filthy ' himself! Upon this false premise there arises inevitably in his mind a dark and gloomy structure, a jumbled pile of complexes, repressions and furtive speculations. Life has been poisoned at its very source! So he goes forth to India or elsewhere to impress in a hushed voice and with a clouded mien this amazing and unwholesome doctrine on all whom he can influence or command. Is it any wonder, in spite of all our exertions and our railways and our reservoirs, that no one wants to have us for long as Governors?

Surely for those who believe in the Redemption such ' sin and wickedness ', so called, as there is in the world should cause no special anxiety. It is the needless waste, the unnecessary cruelty, the stupidity and the mental suffering that agonize the hearts of good men. We could perhaps get on just as well with a little less talk about ' morality ' and a little more of ' fraternity '—of which at present we hear so astonishingly little. It is not so much the muck-rake we want as the sun.

Doubtless Hinduism, like other religions, has been corrupted. As a philosophy it has existed in some form or other for very nearly twice as long as

Christianity, and so may have easily become at least twice as corrupt—that is always the tendency.

It seems to be almost a Law of Life that religions—like other things—should, when assimilated by a race, take on the nature of the organism assimilating them—the faults of the social and political structure into which they are ingested. If Christianity has not become as yet very corrupt it may be because the real spirit of Christianity has never been properly absorbed by the bulk of Europeans. When, if ever, this happy event takes place there will be some danger that we shall Europeanize Christianity far more than that the teaching of Christ will Christianize Europe.

To-day one cannot get a hearing in Europe for the simple teaching of Christ without being assailed by an avalanche of bells, candles, incense, bishops, trinities and virgins, miracles and demons, copes and dalmatics, revelations and inspirations, and in fact all the ‘ properties ’ of the Theological Wardour Street under which Christians are always so busy burying their Christianity. Much the same trouble in a more tropical and exaggerated form has invaded and corrupted and almost buried Hinduism, of which yet enough remains to be a comfort and consolation to hundreds of millions of men and women in the four hundred thousand cities and villages of India.

Anyone who has read Miss Noble’s remarkable book, *The Web of Indian Life*, and has afterwards visited the so-called Sacred Cities of India or lived in an Indian village, will perceive something of the spirit of nobility that still for all its image-worship and ‘ Phallic-worship ’ exists in Hinduism. They will realize that humility and love are still widespread in that dusty, impoverished and unhappy sub-continent, that half-starved drudgery still unflinchingly performs its daily duty of cleansing and prayer, that heights of resignation and renunciation are still reached in Asia which are not often attained in Europe.

When we look at the Puritan criticizing we have to understand from whence and how this mentality originated. A succession of Bills-of-Mortality against which even Nature’s fecundity could not compete, had drained England of her more generous, enterprising and ardent spirits. The Crusades, the Wars of the Roses, the Black Death and the Civil War had left as a consequence a less generous and less human type for a time predominant. Puritanism was perhaps a useful if unpleasant corrective, and India drained by plague and famine of certain types, and passing through a period of tribulation, will perhaps have her own Puritan revival; but it will, if and when it comes, come from within, and come considerably hampered by the appalling poverty and uncertainty of life. Plague and famine, and the mind-deadening poison of malaria, do not conduce to either good order or Puritan revivals.

But it is no help to those Indians who dream of reforms if the minds of those they would reform are irritated and prejudiced against all reforms by antagonistic criticisms of their religion by outsiders —by sneers at their social order by partially informed persons of other races. Especially does any English criticism wound and cause suspicion, because the Indian has a number of reasons—or thinks he has—for suspecting our motives. Nor is it any help to the reformers when we break out into murderous schoolboy reprisals like the Amritsar massacre, or grotesque indignities such as the Crawling Order. It puts the clock back, because for years after events of this sort, no European suggestion is likely to be received with anything except impatient disgust or open suspicion.

We do not yet realize the reactions of that ghastly massacre at Amritsar. It is so easy for us, trained as we have been, to think of it as a natural, or almost a natural, thing to happen. The General we think of—as a Prefect!—the Head of the School!—the Little-Tin-God!—He is naturally scandalized and furious that the Indians—the ‘ lesser breeds ’—the lowest form in the Lower School should openly defy his authority. For such outrageous things surely boiling oil is scarcely bad enough—but machine-guns! Certainly—why not?

Whenever the Puritan revival shows its head in India it will certainly be regarded as an anti-English move, because it will insist on many things being stopped that we find profitable to continue. For instance, it will demand almost certainly the exclusion of British whisky and spirits from India! Then we shall be in haste to declare that this ‘ puritanism ’ is only an excuse for ‘ sedition ’, and the destruction of crippled British trade. The censorious are apt to be saddened when some determined move on the part of those they censure makes any further reprobation sound impertinent. The criticism of the Americans, the Russians and the Chinese when they gave up whisky, vodka, and opium, must have surprised the reformers in those countries. A reform that is unprofitable to other countries is apt to be held up as a proof that the reformers are only reckless revolutionaries, bent on upsetting everything and everybody.

There are Church dignitaries who appear to be positively alarmed at any sudden prospect of their being no more war or no more drunkenness. They seem to see their occupation slipping away—a kind of vested interest in ' sin '. Their war medals are proudly worn in church, for the mentality of warlike Israel is there and not that of the New Testament.

We are told that militant clerics fortified and encouraged with the Holy Communion our men in the front line trenches when about to attack! Surely a strange perversion of the doctrines of the Prince of Peace—that His Blood should be offered to those about to imbrue their own hands in the blood of their fellow-men. The conqueror-complex of the Priests of the Chosen People dies hard in Europe.

We shall most probably hear for a long time much about morality and immorality in India—and in England. We shall be almost persuaded to believe that morality—the conventional morality of England in 1930—is a kind of end in itself and not merely a means to an end—the end and aim being human happiness. One might almost suppose that unconsciously some dark futuristic motive lurks in the mind of the zealous Puritan. He is persuaded that for him life is not worth living and that it certainly ought not to be made too pleasant for others to live—that in fact it ought to be made so unpleasant that we none of us will want to have any children or wish to live any longer. He may not have a very difficult task to convince many of this in India—but he is not going to make it an easier country to govern.

Macaulay—was a suggestion of inordinate immorality even then a ‘ best seller ’?—felt disturbed that some Indian rulers spent too much time ‘ chewing Bhang and fondling concubines ’; yet even these too seductive influences could hardly be blamed for the ravages of malaria and famine. From accounts of the morals of his contemporaries, alcohol was responsible for as much inefficiency amongst statesmen in Europe as ‘ Bhang ’ had produced in Asia. The meanest intelligence can realize that large differences in climate, race, culture and surroundings necessitate and justify large variations in habit and indulgence. The pleasing assumption that it is morally worse to chew bhang or smoke haschisch or opium in Asia than to dope oneself with alcohol in Europe, scarcely bears examination. In the raw fog of northern Europe, alcohol is comforting, if not beneficial. The Asiatic suffering from over-stimulation by the actinic rays of a vertical sun, or other local condition, finds comfort in soporific drugs less injurious to the liver than alcohol. If our officials lived and died in India—instead of being birds of passage—they would not be so prejudiced.

CHAPTER SIX

A STIFF-NECKED GENERATION

HE HARDENED THEIR HEARTS

§ I

BECAUSE the writer has criticized the brutality and stupidity which has become a system at our great Public Schools he will probably be told by their sentimental admirers that his account is exaggerated or imaginary, or that since his time, which is not so very long ago, things have much changed. He rather doubts the change if only because Public Schools in particular live upon their traditions, and their traditions, at any rate as regards organization and discipline, are mainly a mixture of monkish mediævalism and feudalism. We are constantly being told that things have changed and just as constantly, on making careful inquiries, we find they have changed very little, or only in name. It may be, therefore, worth while, for the benefit of those readers who do not know what a Public School can be like, and what it still may be like, to recall the kind of treatment children receive when admitted to one of our great Public Schools or to the preparatory sections of them, which often take children of between eight and nine years of age. The writer did not himself suffer as severely as some of his smaller and weaker comrades, but the memory of the treatment he saw meted out to the feebler of his small companions—weak and inoffensive as they were—fills him, even to this day, with anger and contempt.

He remembers on the first day at school a small friend who had been his playmate before they had entered and who had joined the school with him, being roughly cross-examined by an older and bigger boy as to what the rank and profession of his father was. His parent was but a Major in the Royal Engineers. This was not considered ‘ high ’ enough to suit the prestige of the school or rather the social aspirations of the young bully who was his questioner. My friend was curtly asked why his father was not a General! Unable to give a satisfactory answer—indeed the astonished child was unable to make any answer—he received from the bigger boy such a violent blow, full in the face, that he fell off the stone step on which the three of us were standing. And I remember that he crouched there against the wall sobbing and inconsolable amidst the jeers of some of the older boys for a considerable time. I had escaped. For some reason or other, perhaps because I was bigger or because my father's social position met with more approval, I had not then been struck; but I stood, gazing with astonishment and depression at my small friend. It was the first time in my life I had ever seen anyone so unjustly used, and it was the first time I had ever seen him cry, for my friend, though smaller than myself, had always been much braver. When we had roamed together on the cliffs in Cornwall and had fallen and gashed our knees, it had been I and not he who had wept and been frightened when the blood continued to flow. It had been he who had bandaged up our knees and had found the way back in the gathering gloom. He was not afraid of pain. It was the brutal and humiliating injustice that shook his small frame and brought about this first outburst of weeping.

On the first night in the dormitory the usual *séance* for new boys was duly staged in accordance with all those ‘ fine old traditions ’ of our Public Schools about which we are for ever being told. Myself, my small friend and the other new boys were ‘ put through it ’. Naked or nearly naked and shivering upon a dormitory table, we were made to sing some not particularly edifying songs and snatches of hymns. . . . There was a parody of a certain well-known hymn that would not have been exactly a success in a church. . . . Rather terrified, our tremulous and feeble efforts at song provoked mirth.

I remember one pale-faced little shrimp who sized up the military situation with accuracy and dispatch. He gave his audience in a thin, quavering voice the first few jingling lines of a well-known school bawd, ‘ As I was going to Salisbury ’. He escaped further baiting and later achieved a popularity which the writer remembers envying. He had the makings of a good General. Some of us were—as little English boys can sometimes be—fair to look upon, and these, in particular, were questioned closely concerning their families. Their sisters’ ages, habits and physical appearance were gone into in some detail—with appropriate asides—that we were too young to properly appreciate.

One small boy was sufficiently attractive to be sneered at by a Master in classroom as ‘ the Artist’s Model ’. This is the sort of covert insult and mean innuendo it is so safe and easy for a grown man and a schoolmaster to fling at a terrified urchin. It was an injudicious taunt. Of course it went the rounds and brought the small victim attentions from various quarters he was not always in the mood for, or prepared to reciprocate.

So the thing went on. Treasured letters from a mother, photographs and other small things were taken and passed round for critical examination or ridicule, and not always returned. Stealing of everything but money from the smaller boys was common and quite open. One boy, I remember, had written down the name of a small friend, a girl of about his own age—he was then between eight or nine—for whom he had apparently a very deep affection and whose name no doubt to him was as sacred as his mother’s. The name had been written in the fly-leaf of a prayer-book that his mother had given him. It provided, when it was discovered, a fresh source for inquisition, ridicule and salacious remarks; at length he was driven into furtively destroying the book because it was so constantly being called for. These seem now, perhaps, to grown-up people but trifles, or at least we as children were told they were. But to us they were heart-searing realities that could only result in turning us, as it did turn us in our turn, into rather bitter and cynical little cads, no better than the others. There is no need to be lurid about schoolboy immorality and rather too much importance is given to it. When sentimentality is the culmination and expression of devotion, admiration and fidelity, it probably does no very great harm and is but a phase that is easily outgrown. It was not this but the brutality of things which coarsened us and to which, alas! we became so quickly inured.

The masters bullied and threatened and tortured and so did the prefects and the bigger boys, and there were worse things than mere torture. There were things that were procured by force and secured by threats. One boy, in front of forty of the same House, was subjected to indignities the description of which one could not in England find a publisher to print. And *we* were to go out after this and teach morals and 'self-control'! and set an example of Christian kindliness to the Poor Heathen! Ye Gods! the blind leading the blind sounds common sense in comparison. We *may* perhaps have helped to corrupt Asia, we can hardly pretend we have helped to spread the Gospel of Love. I do not say that we were always unhappy, because the damnable thing is that children are so adaptable, however evil their conditions may be. We were but boys in a small hell, Spirits in Prison, who grew to almost like and to back up their prison against the rival establishments that were no better. We were going through the 'hardening' process of which the English Upper Classes are constantly prating. Well, we got 'hard' all right, Pharaoh's heart wasn't in it! Our hearts became as hard as our knuckles, our consciences atrophied and our brains but a wilderness of disordered facts—Greek irregular verbs and snatches of patriotic songs. We learned to forget much of what we had known when we first went to school and what we learnt instead had not made us any better. Presently, older, we would go forth in platoons as officials and professional and business men, legions in white polo breeches—unconsciously to break down the ideals of others—unconsciously to break the Empire we boasted of; to lower, by our behaviour and our callous conduct, the prestige of the country that had nurtured us. My small companion did not, I think, ever quite recover from the first bitter disillusionment. The child that had been so fearless and so generous became cold and sulky, reticent and cynical, not all at once, but by degrees as the iron entered his soul. He is probably now an official or an employer of labour, arbitrary and domineering and withering with his tongue the self-respect of some humbled and terrified employee. And we, who are well-to-do, pretend to wonder that Socialism has come to stay!

If anyone should think this picture overdrawn, let him go and stand outside the entrance to one of our great Public Schools to-day and scrutinize the faces of the older boys and those having authority. On how many of these young faces will he see an expression of cruelty, pride, ill-temper and arrogant disdain beginning their deadly course. The faces may not be free, perhaps, of sensuality—a boy at this period of his life cannot always escape that—but on such young faces, at the least, cruelty and evil-temper and arrogance would not and could not, were they not encouraged by an evil and privileged system, find so frequently a place.

Some mitigation in this state of affairs there may be, but even so the present generation of our rulers are men between forty-five and seventy—*they* went through this mill which ground out from their character nearly every tendency for sympathy, almost every inclination to gentleness and tolerance and understanding without which they can make but sorry administrators. It is this type who went through these mills who now sit in the London Law Courts and in Allahabad and condemn to the lash and imprisonment without a qualm. Why should they have any qualms? Why should they dread the fire who pretend that they themselves went through the furnace and came out, as they boast, ‘ well baked ’? The conduct of our Administration in India and at home will not greatly change until these men have passed away—or it will only change with an upheaval that probably even the Communists do not really desire. But the steady manufacture of such a type must be stopped now even if we have to have a second ‘ suppression ’ of those monastic institutions which our insane Traditionalism tolerates to-day.

The modern parent, forgetting his own boyhood, querulously demands why he is never told. Does he forget that there is nothing a boy dreads so much as ‘ giving away ’ his School and his comrades to ‘ outsiders ’? He is, too, terrified of being thought either a ‘ sneak ’ or a ‘ whiner ’. Often if he does complain, he is rebuked by his parents, who suspect him of trying to escape the ‘ wholesome discipline ’ of school and do not want the trouble of investigation. At first he is too small to be listened to, and later he is already implicated in what he would disclose. Moreover, there is no one so sensitive, so reticent (especially with his blood-relations), so shy and self-conscious and so indisposed to wear his broken heart upon his sleeve—‘ for daws to peck at ’ —as the English boy; and all praise to him that it is so—but his sterling qualities, his courage and stolid endurance are there because of his race, because of the North wind; they were not put there by his school. If he leaves his school a kindly and tolerant and sympathetic gentleman, it will be in spite of his Public School training, not because of it. Which of us, seeing what he has been through, can have the impertinence to blame him for being insolent and contemptuous, or for behaving afterwards like a bully? Unfortunately the Empire suffers for the sins of the grotesque and barbarous system which it employs to brutalize its governing classes.

There is an account of the method employed for castigating the children of the Upper Classes at another School not far from the one which has been described. A prefect, one is informed, is allowed to ‘ run five yards ’ before each stroke when he is flogging a small victim in order ‘ to get up momentum for the blow ’. He shall ‘ count up to twenty ’, the rule continues, between each blow in order to let it soak in and increase the agony of suspense of his small victim. The scene is easy to imagine. The entreaties, the tears and the howls of the smaller child; the sound of the blows are heard by the group of small fry collected outside the door of the prefect's study who listen with a mixture of fear and unholy exultation to the cries and blows. What an excellent elementary lesson in sadism—how ridiculous to pretend that these same people, when they grow up, will never thrash their native servants, for the boy who is being flogged was perhaps a refractory or ' cheeky ' servant, an indolent ' fag ' whose duty it was to obey the behests of his lord and master, aged perhaps sixteen or seventeen!

A prefect of a great Public School, less than fifty miles from London, remembers that the headmaster, when flogging, used to so lose control of himself that the Governors of the School—to avoid scandal—ordered one of the School officials to be present, to see that the sadistic fury of this old gentleman did not land him in the Police Court and the small delinquent in hospital. It is recognized that there are few, even schoolmasters, who are safe to flog children—there must be still fewer schoolboys.

§ 2

In his book *Goodbye to All That,* Mr. Robert Graves records without comment how the officers of the British regiment with whom he served despised not only the temporary soldier but even other regular regiments. Newly-joined officers were still treated with gratuitous schoolboy rudeness and the seniors ‘ treated the French civilians just like “ niggers ”—kick them about ’! Yet evidently Mr. Graves was a brave and trustworthy officer, by no means deficient in breeding or education.

A distinguished Cavalry Officer, who at school was Head of his House, permits me to add his own comparatively recent experiences at Eton. The writer served with this officer in the War, and he was of anything but the ‘ namby-pamby ’ type. During his first year at school, though admittedly quick, intelligent and well-behaved and at one of the quietest Houses, he was beaten ‘ on an average twenty times a term ’, by the bigger boys, for imaginary offences or for some trivial breach of schoolboy etiquette. He described how some of the others, smaller than himself or more stupid, or naturally more clumsy, were ‘ beaten nearly every day ’. One is told to fetch a large jug of hot water; while carrying it he is given a kick and because, in consequence, some of the water is spilt, is then given a flogging by an older boy, presumably a prefect. There is a touch almost of sadism in this behaviour. And these are the young ‘ gentlemen ’ who are afterwards to be our Judges and Lieutenant-Governors and High Commissioners!

At another great school one of the ‘ fags ’ received a good ‘ hammering ’ because he had burnt the toast. You hear him whining and snivelling outside the door for a quarter of an hour afterwards. After all, if one may cuff the son of an Earl because he has burnt the toast, why shouldn’t one be equally severe, at least to a coolie in Penang who has dropped your suit-case.

You hear another small boy called a ‘ little swine ’ and also receiving some chastisement. There seems to be no particular reason except that his uncle is the owner of a popular newspaper whose political opinions are considered odious by the parents of the boys at this particular school. Gradually it becomes accepted as good form to put up with this sort of treatment and, of course, to pass it on to others when one is older and stronger.

A coolie who struck a white sahib, or an officer in uniform, because he had himself been struck, or brutally insulted, would be lucky if he escaped being accused of sedition and gaoled or given a severe flogging.

The men who were put ‘ through it ’ at Public Schools and Sandhurst between 1870 and 1900 are unlikely to be humane and merciful, or even sympathetic. Through no fault of their own they were more or less corrupted in their youth and it must be an accident when they turn out to be merciful judges, or suitable for Prison Commissioners or Governors of Prisons.

But our advances in hygiene are keeping alive this very class, who, but for the improvement in general health, would have passed away from gout, bronchitis and renal trouble. As we have prolonged the working years of this older generation there has been a notable slowing down in the more humane movements that were in full swing sixty years ago. We still flog our children and we still indulge in blood sports. The newspapers contain reports of boys of 15 or 16 being forcibly held down, and, after being overpowered by two or three grown men, flogged because of some comparatively trivial offence.

One hears from all sides the same stories and told by those who professedly admire our Public School system. At one great school, before a smaller boy is flogged by his bigger comrades, the flesh of the buttocks is marked with a line of chalk to ensure that all the blows of the cane which is to be used shall fall as nearly as possible on the same strip of flesh and thereby cause added pain and an increased bruising.

At another famous school less than fifty miles from London, a boy who is rather too gentle to be considered a ‘ gentleman ’, has his head enclosed with a pillow case which is then filled with gas from a tube. He is rescued just in time by one of the masters, but none of the ‘ young gentlemen ’ who took part in this monstrous outrage are expelled, nor is the supervising House-master dismissed for inefficiency. Such a state of affairs if it took place in a Government service would be followed by a public inquiry and the cashiering or imprisonment of those responsible—that at least is what would ordinarily happen.

A school where this sort of thing can occur should be closed down. It is easy enough for one’s children to learn brutality in the streets for nothing. There can scarcely be any need to pay £250 a year for this accomplishment.

It is true we *talk* a great deal about doing away with violence (war) in international affairs, but we are now in no hurry to do away with it in our dealings with one another. Yet abstention from violence must begin in our homes and in our youth. All pacifist talk by those accustomed to bully and to flog is mere waste of breath. It is almost impudence for men who have been brought up under the conditions that exist at the average Public School to pretend in the House of Commons that ‘ niggers ’ are not knocked about by those who have learned in their youth to think nothing of knocking one another about.

The writer, like vast numbers of other people, is compelled by law, public opinion and his own better feelings to contribute in taxes towards the assistance of those less fortunate or mentally and physically weaker than himself. The obligation on the strong to help the weak is not only the basis of social democracy but the very foundation of civilization. It is astonishing, therefore, that our governing classes should be taught at school that the stronger and bigger have the right to the services of those who are not only weaker and younger than themselves, but less experienced, rather helpless, and often very homesick. Such an amazing inversion of our ‘ duty towards our neighbour ’ could scarcely exist without deleterious effects afterwards on the body politic. That it definitely has detrimental effects no one can doubt for a moment who has listened to members of our governing class sneering at the League of Nations, at any suggestions for social amelioration, a more humanizing prison discipline, or a more humane penal code.

Obviously generations of young men brought up to consider it right and proper that the smaller and weaker should wait upon them must in their hearts still believe that women being the weaker sex should continue to be the bond slave of the male. The revolt of women in the last thirty years has not been so much an immoral revolt against their duties but rather a perfectly natural reaction against this monstrous assumption that the weak are ordained by a Deity to wait upon the strong. By implication it would follow that the Italians being physically the weaker should be content to wait upon the English, and that a small country like Belgium should wish for no better ' discipline ' than to be the ' fag ' and body servant of a large and powerful country like Germany or France.

It happens that age and strength are seldom happy unless they are employed in service to their fellows. But, sentiment apart, it is surely only common sense, if there is any ' waiting-on ' to be done at all in our Public Schools, that the stronger and the more experienced should wait on those comparatively helpless, and not the reverse. That this happens to be also the teaching of the Prophet of Nazareth, no doubt suggests an additional objection to our governing class, who have decided that so far from being a very clever man who knew what He was talking about—an inspired Genius—He was but a ' sentimentalist ', useful as a kind of decorative symbol in stained-glass windows and on public memorials.

There is much interested propaganda concerning the ‘ character building ’ which is supposed to take place in our English Public Schools. This claim deceives no one who studies English history. One thinks of so many of the outstanding characters in English history—Chaucer, Shakespeare, Philip Sydney, Oliver Cromwell, Nelson, Stephenson, Joseph Chamberlain, Cecil Rhodes, Darwin, Wells, Lloyd George, and a host of others, the vast majority of whom were never at a Public School or, if they were, left their schools unhappy or in disgrace.

§ 3

In the refinements of the ‘ hardening ’ process and the bullying, mental and physical, to which the children of the upper classes are subjected at school, there is evident the germ of the behaviour towards the Indian and other folk of the writer and his contemporaries.

For this process begins soon after the child has left the nursery, and is continued during the more impressionable years. Its reactions are still active in most of us long after middle-age, its filaments reach down into the very deeps of our mental processes.

Parents agree that their children do usually come back coarser, less affectionate, rougher and more callous from school. There is no doubt where the mischief lies. A heart roughly and bitterly disillusioned in childhood never quite recovers its sensibility to injustice, its natural frankness and generosity. Here, then, in these schools lies the *fons et origo* of so much we deplore—here is the head and front of our offending, the secret of our Indian troubles and of our class war which, in England, is by no means entirely, as on the Continent, only an economic struggle, but something deeper and more bitter.

It is not only the brick walls of his Public School that confine the public schoolboy day and night. It is a close corporation of puerility in which he lives. He has little real freedom and, as always, every diminished liberty causes an added decline in *morale* —he has not, like the day-boy, any opportunity to determine his conduct by his private judgment, it must only be the school convention to which he must conform.

Is it sufficiently realized that the seeds of cruelty, ill-temper, bigotry and egoism as well as those of sloth, class-pride and the form of insincerity which we call snobbishness, are many of them sown at our Public Schools? These are the real, anti-social vices. Probably their ill-effects are much worse afterwards on the body politic than we realize. The bully is at least as anti-social as the voluptuary. It is but a truism to say that ill-temper and mental and physical cruelty embitter and ruin as many lives as any other failing.

We are inclined to over-rate the advantages that are supposed to accrue from the habit of stolid endurance which the Public School boy has to cultivate during his years of school-life. The endurance of anything felt to be evil that a little more initiative and pluck might displace is not necessarily a fine quality—it may even be due to sloth. Revolution, even in small matters, requires much energy and initiative, much patient preparation, and often more 'endurance' than an acquiescence in what is not approved of, and which may lead to moral and material disaster, as the worthy, stolid, docile and disciplined subjects of the Kaiser have found to their cost.

We English Traditionalists need to be reminded that nearly all the greatest characters in history were either non-conformists or Agitators, some of the very greatest were both. It was Christ and not Satan who was the rebel against the pretensions of the High Priest, the Imperialist ambitions of Pagan Rome, and the conventional 'good form' of His time.

There is at least one serious and definite injury that our Public Schools have done to our upper classes, one which their warmest apologists do not deny. By increasing steadily and to an exorbitant degree the charges made for education and maintenance, they have made it more and more impossible for the classes that are—or at least should be—the best in England, to afford to have any children to educate! As long ago as 1910 it was costing between £300 and £500 a year to send one boy to Eton, where he was lucky if he learned anything much more than how to play cricket and a smattering of history and Latin. Naturally, inevitably this class is tending to disappear.

The writer of this book will not be accused of any partiality for the English upper classes—but given a training that would develop a liberality in their minds and encourage a sympathetic outlook and gentleness in their manners towards all, and not the exclusiveness and snobbish arrogance, which is developed at present—then the English upper classes would stand again second to none, for undoubtedly good material is there. It is the training that is so corrupting and brutalizing. Admitting that there is always in young boys a tendency, perhaps, to snobbishness and to exaggerate the importance of mere animal powers, what must be the effect of a training at school which exaggerates the importance of games and not of intellectual achievement, and is by its very nature exclusive? The Town and Gown antagonism at Oxford is but a symptom of a deep social disease.

Probably no greater service could be done to this class and indirectly to the Empire and the world at large than to close down these tradition-ridden haunts of corruption and to compel all England's children to attend England's national schools. One result, at least, of this would be that we should all learn to speak with the same accent and the gulf betwixt the classes would cease to widen, it would rather tend to rapidly disappear. Moreover, the advent of a more critical and influential clientèle to our national schools would hasten an immense improvement therein. The children of the upper classes would *not* be swamped, for breeding, stamina and physique will always tell. Under these less artificial surroundings many would come to the front who now rot in our Public Schools, secure, slothful and self-satisfied. Much of our present futile snobbery and class friction would disappear in a homogeneous whole that would be once more a nation.

When we were rich, powerful and without rivals, we could—at a risk and at a sacrifice—afford the luxury and stupidity and waste that these schools represent.

We can afford them no longer.

One of the obsessions that have become popular since Mr. Kipling began to sing to us the praises of ourselves and of ‘ our Empire ’ has been an idea that magnitude has some relationship to merit. It is all but the reverse.

A Great Teacher assured us that where two or three were gathered together in the Name of Truth there was the Spirit of Goodness in the midst of them. He was very careful not to say *two or three hundred or two or three thousand.* He was a good psychologist, and knew, as we all know, that you are more likely to hear the truth yourself and to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth when you are alone with one or two friends. Indeed, he who ‘ would walk with God ’—and the Truth—must often walk alone! It is a truism to say of all great assemblies, whether they be public schools or congregations or parliaments, that it is the Lowest

Common Denominator that rules the roost and not —alas!—the Highest Common Factor.

Probably nowhere is this truer than at a great school where every refinement of thought, every gentleness and every tender feeling are likely to become the subject of ridicule and mockery. This perhaps explains why hardly one of the great poets, indeed scarcely any great man, has ever been anything but unhappy and discontented when immured in one of these huge institutions that are called ‘ schools ’. In such places the very elements of injustice are regularly taught. Thus a schoolmaster or a bigger boy may, with impunity, insult someone smaller and weaker than himself! Small physical weaknesses, deficiencies in intellect, unfortunate social connections and even a lack of personal beauty are made the subject of scornful remarks in classes which should be devoted to the study of history or the acquisition of a foreign language. No disclaimer or reply is permitted to these insults. And then we are impudently told that our children are being taught ‘ manners ’ at school.

The schoolmasters blame the parents because they are not interested—but the moment the parent becomes interested, the schoolmaster says he is ‘ interfering ’ and the boy is marked down as a target for more sarcasms and insolence for something of which he is guiltless and to which he dare not reply. No doubt there are parents who prefer to go off to yawn at Biarritz or gape at Goodwood, who are more interested in missions to the ‘ heathen ’ than in their children’s welfare, and who are glad to get rid of their children, glad to escape the necessities of having to give them any advice themselves.

The ‘ hardening ’ process whose after-effects are so evident in India, and whose bitterness of spirit brought us only three years ago within sight of a revolution in England, is not the educative process it is supposed to be because it is produced by the *wrong methods*. Pain and hardships patiently endured are good things when they are the results of man’s attempt to subdue the forces of nature. No explorer is, morally speaking, any the worse but much the better for what he has endured—in facing heat and cold, hunger and thirst, danger and vicissitude. But the ‘ hardening ’ process that is the result of human brutality one to the other, of the exhibition of the domination-complex in all its mean and sadistic manifestations is entirely another thing and has quite different reactions. One who falls when scaling a mountain and injures himself, feels no real resentment and carries about with him afterwards no vindictive feeling of revenge, nor, most important of all, does he lose his self-respect. Moreover, the pain in such a case may be educative. But the resentment and the passion produced by blows and sarcasms are terribly bad educators; they corrode the character, they do not consolidate it. The disastrous effects of a bullying sergeant-major’s unanswerable sarcasms on the barrack square are visible years afterwards in the detention prison and the guard-room of the unit. But bullying is contagious, and there lies in the mind of even the best-tempered man the feeling that he will get his own back some day on his fellow-man for the indignities to which he has had to submit.

The writer makes no attack on the Public Schools on account of what is usually considered to be their chief failing—sexual immorality—due, it is supposed, if and when it exists, to herding up a large number of boys during puberty in close contiguity. He believes that there is so much exaggeration in all this talk. Even if it were true, it has to be remembered that all the finer and more altruistic emotions are developed, as concomitants, almost as the result, of sex. Step by step as the sex develops, the emotions, the intellect, the imagination and the sympathies of the individual enlarge—just as the perfume and the colour increase as the flower develops. At this stage fussy interference and moral pi-jaw are apt to do more harm than good and tend to create those perplexing 'complexes' we would avoid. As Emerson says, one should have no more than a 'bowing' acquaintance with one's 'sins'. Denunciation and Indulgence are the obverse and reverse of the same coin.

It would be very much better if less attention was paid both in the positive and negative direction to these developments in adolescence. The best thing to be done is to do nothing to encourage or artificially stimulate appetites and tendencies already quite strongly enough developed in most of us—at least, in most males. Unfortunately, Exhibitionism is so rampant in the cinema, the novel and in other directions, that even the growing boy's interests are constantly being deflected towards sex and his appetite titillated by outside influences, which are supposed to be quite innocuous. And women do not really help, because so much of their attention seems to be concentrated—whether they own it or not—on drawing everyone's attention to the desirable nature of female bodies. Naturally this does not pass unnoticed by the boy at school, who, if he ever does manage to forget for a day or two his sex and its seductive and frequent urgencies, is speedily reminded thereof by some entirely unwanted and gratuitous ' purity ' talk or pi-jaw from a preacher or a master whose own mind is so evidently much too concentrated on this aspect of human behaviour.

On the other hand, it is both cruel and stupid to be in a hurry to punish individuals for sex misbehaviour, however irregular or unorthodox or premature you may decide that it is for the other person, who, whatever his apparent age, may be in one or other direction—mind, imagination or internal sex apparatus—much more developed than even the doctor suspects. It is, psychologically speaking, a mistake to punish in these cases for fairly obvious reasons; for not only is the reaction of force likely to be equal and *opposite*, but punishment always involves some degradation and loss of self-respect. This is especially true when it is punishment inflicted because one human being refuses to conform to the sex standards of another, whose necessities may be less, and for whom, too, he may, for quite other reasons, have no very special respect or affection. The loss of self-respect, the degradation of being flogged, put in solitary confinement or imprisonment acts only as an evil auxiliary to that precocity or interest in sex matters for which the individual is presumably being punished, and this is at least one reason why persons sent to prison or reformatories for sex offences, not only so often become addicted to self-abuse (this obviously needs no explanation), but in the majority of cases also leave the prison so very much more degraded than when they went in.

To pretend to a child or to any young human being at this critical period that they are possessed of an evil spirit or ‘ vicious and depraved ’ is about the surest way to make them so; more particularly when the act is not itself an obviously anti-social one. Crimes involving violence, cruelty, dishonesty or fraud must, of course, be restrained whether they be sexual or otherwise, but the flogging of children and others whom we consider have behaved ‘ indecently ’ is the most futile and damaging thing we could possibly do; even if there were no other objection to flogging in itself. As for solitary confinement and imprisonment for such cases—it is the counsel of the Devil. There are probably no better auxiliaries in this world to morbid and Satanic influences than the flogging block and the gaoler’s key; they are the very last resort, not the first. Almost one might say that if a man really needs flogging, he had much better not be at all. We had better remove him, painlessly, from the earth than corrupt him and ourselves still further by the application of violence and the loss of such self-respect as he may still possess. Which things might be written up in every magistrate’s court, in England as well as in India.

There is something curiously out of proportion in the criticism of sex morals when applied to India, a country in which there are said to be more than a hundred million people who never, from year's end to year's end, have one single wholesome and sufficient meal, and whose expectation of life is so short —for whom life in any case is so precarious—that if the sex cycle be not completed at an early age, it would for countless millions never be completed at all. It reminds one of our own inconsequence in Europe, where we encouraged twenty millions of the best of our young men to indulge in murder and every form of brutality for four years, and then, when at last they came back—morally speaking—drenched in blood, some of us threw up our hands in pious horror because one of them had stolen a suitcase and yet another had seduced a parlourmaid!

The Indians cried to an 'Impartial American' for bread and they are recommended the stony diet of sexual continence; a continence that, considering the short expectation of life and what conditions are in India, would almost amount to abstinence—an all but impossible abstinence. It's so easy to write this kind of prescription for other folk to drink, and it gives the prescriber a fine claim to moral eminence. But it does not deceive or satisfy the Indian, nor does it convince any male who has tried the prescription, or anything like it, under the same circumstances.

Meanwhile with India discontented, Russia and Egypt suspicious, we must go cap in hand to Paris or to Washington to beg, to borrow or to make excuses.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE LORDS OF MISRULE

§ 1. *Becoming Humility*

SHORTLY after arrival in India the writer was out riding in a country district with an English official. My companion evidently expected every native we passed to make obeisance to us. Those carrying umbrellas were expected to close them and make a salaam, and even those riding were expected to dismount as a mark of respect. My companion impressed on me, as I was also an official, the importance of insisting on this humility on the part of the native.

During the ride an Indian who passed riding an ass, with his wife up behind him, was beaten by my companion for not having dismounted until shouted at. The ass in the meantime made off, with the frightened wife—who was little more than a child—making futile attempts to hold it. I saw her disappear into the jungle, her white sari still drawn tightly around her head lest she should see the terrifying white Sahibs.

I had just come from Meerut, where, in my father's day, the Indian Mutiny started. Somehow I began dimly to understand how a mutiny might arise; and even to wonder that there had not been another since.

The odd thing is that my companion was in the ordinary way one of the most genial old Scotsmen you could wish to meet. In his own country he probably would not have hurt a fly or beaten a refractory dog; but the sight of an Indian, especially one who failed to make his due obeisance, would annoy him intensely.

Though such marks of humility are not now usually exacted in India, the poorer Indians are still expected to make elaborate obeisance, which, unlike a military salute, is seldom, if ever, returned.

What would be an Englishman's feeling were he compelled to salute and humiliate himself to a foreign invader of England—and at the same time have to listen to reproaches as to his 'disloyalty'! How can anyone be expected to be 'loyal' to an invader—and especially to one who treats him with undisguised contempt?

These obeisances are more often exacted from Indians if they are wearing native dress. The tendency is to treat Indians who are wearing European clothes with rather more civility and consideration. An Indian in native dress, unless he is a rajah or a person of considerable wealth or importance, would be refused admission in many hotels, clubs and other places of resort in India! This is an extraordinary state of affairs, although it is accepted without comment by Englishmen in India. It reminds one of the notice placed up in a park in Shanghai to the effect that 'Dogs and Chinese are not admitted'. A notice erected by Englishmen in China!

So the Indian buys a cheap suit of ready-made European clothes, and some equally unbecoming head-dress, and almost at once he ceases to be treated as a mere 'nigger' or coolie. The native dress, because it is easily washable, is far more suitable and hygienic for a country where the heat causes such profuse sweating; it is also far cheaper and infinitely more picturesque; and quite as practicable for most purposes. It is one of the minor disadvantages of our odd manners that an Indian feels safer from insult if he copies our unattractive clothes, instead of wearing the costume he is used to, and in which he looks more dignified and distinguished.

§ 2. *Law and Order*

A code of Laws imposed by an outsider, however admirable they may be on paper, is merely an opportunity for blackmail if it is in advance of conditions and general education; or for any other reason unable to be enforced. There are many in the Indian Penal Code which could not be strictly enforced in any European or English town.

There are, for example, the laws—admirable enough—to promote sanitation and public decency.

We have been so busy extending the already gigantic area of our Indian Empire in Beluchistan, Burma, and elsewhere that we seem to have over-looked the fact that the greater part of India is still without any form of sanitation.

Not only are the majority of Indian cities and towns inadequately provided with public lavatories and similar conveniences, but in the vast majority of all the millions of dwellings in India there is no sort of sanitary convenience whatever. The Indian's habits have therefore perforce to be very primitive. Yet the police can blackmail at will all those who technically break the sanitary laws.

A mere threat to take the offending individual to the thana or police station, where he or she would probably be ill-treated and knocked about, will usually produce the bribe the policeman is expecting. The innocent 'culprit' would not be brought up before the Magistrate, unless the police intended to make statements further aggravating the charge into an offence 'against decency', which always has a sinister sound to the ears of a Magistrate. In the ordinary way they would probably keep the offender for a day at the station, and then, after a good beating, let him go. Rather than get a beating, and into the policeman's 'bad books', and waste a whole day without food in the police station, the unfortunate Indian would prefer to bribe his persecutor, even if it means a whole day's wages in money or in kind.

It is not difficult for a fully clothed Indian policeman to obtain a conviction against members of the poorer classes for offences 'against decency'. Often the culprit wears nothing when at work but a rag round the waist and is too ignorant to realize that what he does not find shocking himself can easily be represented as having shocked other people. Until the police are more under the control of the people they can blackmail, this is bound to continue. You cannot centralize police control without getting a great deal of tyranny and blackmail, especially amongst an uneducated population.

Even in England, where the police are under local control and where the general population are educated and can obtain legal aid, blackmail and perjury are not unknown. The obvious remedy under present conditions is for the Indian police to have less power and very much stricter supervision; but this is just what we dare not insist upon while the police realize that our dominion in India depends so largely on their support. The back-lash of our unpopularity hits our Administration in many ways. India is the land of vicious circles.

The writer has seen an Indian Mohammedan policeman in a Hindu village helping himself generously to vegetables and other food from the baskets of villagers carrying their wares to market. He does it with an easy swagger, and none of the villagers dares resist or express resentment on pain of finding himself arrested shortly afterwards for some technical offence under the Indian Penal Code, whose far-reaching prohibitions it is safe to say could touch, if applied strictly, not only every Indian, but the majority of Englishmen in India.

In this Penal Code—Draconian almost in its severity—we have imposed on the Indian rigid laws whose strictness concerning moral behaviour and decency would not be tolerated in colder countries where a better educated and more civilized community have far less excuse for their transgressions.

The power thus placed in the hands of the police would be dangerous anywhere; what this must cost in bribes, persecutions, and a demoralizing sense of insecurity to the three hundred and twenty millions in India, it is impossible even to imagine. We have tried or are trying to do much the same thing in Egypt, Burma, Ceylon and other tropical Dependencies, and with the same inevitable increase of discontent.

One would expect far more lenient laws more lightly administered in Bengal than in England; whereas the very opposite is the case. It is, or should be, far easier to behave with restraint in a cold country, but we evidently believe it to be less so; for we apply a stricter code of law to a half-naked coolie in Lahore than we should dare to apply in Liverpool.

It is urged that we make up for our severity by building reservoirs, and constructing railways and Protestant Cathedrals, and building gigantic blocks of offices for officials; but man does not live by bread alone—even the Indian prefers more freedom from petty restraints, persecution, and blackmail, to such very hard-baked and unattractive bread.

The writer, who has had friends amongst the senior ranks of the police, and who has never yet—*absit omen*—been in contact with the police in any country, except occasionally as their official superior, has no sort of personal grievance against the police in India or in England. So far from this is he that he sympathizes with them in the quite impossible nature of the moral duties which busybodies and martinets and over-zealous reformers are always endeavouring to thrust upon shoulders unwilling and unsuitable for such responsibility. Unfortunately, when examining or criticizing the behaviour of police in India—or for that matter in England—one finds that the upper-class Englishman's boasted contempt for logic entraps him into condoning serious abuses in India and often in his own country as well.

No one pretends that even our Prime Ministers are all honest men, though the hands of all of them, we hope, are not 'slimy with treachery'. No one pretends—least of all members of their own families—that all our Bishops and Archbishops always speak the truth. If fifty per cent. of our Bishops and Members of Parliament were always conscientiously accurate we should indeed be well off. But yet, in face of this, our ruling classes, our magistrates and judges—often perhaps, to save themselves trouble—pretend that when you dress up an Englishman or an Indian, who is often little more than a yokel, in a blue uniform and call him a policeman, some magic transformation takes place in his character, and that you can then, in the majority of instances, if not always, believe he is speaking the truth! Too often, if he were to speak the whole truth, he would have to admit that he did not quite see what the accused person actually did, or that he was not looking, or was a little absent-minded, or was, perhaps, a yard or two away from his beat—after all, they are but human—but to admit such a thing would mean a reprimand in India, and probably the same for an English policeman also. The absurd fetish concerning ' uniforms ' and the necessary honesty of persons wearing them, in reality deceives very few persons who have themselves been in a uniformed service for a long period—it is on a par with the Ju-ju beliefs of African savages.

We have lately—and for anyone who has a good memory we have always—been having a series of striking cases in which the personnel of what is probably one of the best police forces in the world, the London police, have been found bullying and ill-treating wretched prostitutes, or committing perjury and blackmail. And for every such case that is detected and afterwards exposed in the Press one can be sure there are very many that escape detection and still more that escape public exposure. Because of the *esprit de corps* and that 'gang' spirit, which in India is called 'Bhai-Bund', which inevitably suggests to a policeman that a little prevarication or perjury to save a fellow-policeman—superior or subordinate—from disgrace and his family from ruin, is, perhaps, not only permissible but rather ' sporting', many must escape exposure. Moreover, the injured parties often dare not bring the police to justice, for not only does that entail a limelight being thrown upon the life, habits and actions of the individual complaining, but the police in India, as well as in England, can be adepts at reprisals—and in some cases have no scruples as to how their accusers' mouth may be shut, or, in extreme cases, on the Continent at least, as to how his body may be disposed of. This is a truism—it has been said a hundred times in the Press—but yet when anybody denounces the behaviour of the police in India, he is liable to be accused of inciting discontent against the British Government! Why hasten to identify Englishmen and their Governments with causes of discontent, when the cause of the discontent is obviously a bad system and a wrong outlook and not any real moral obliquity—unless stupidity is moral obliquity—on the part of the Government? Surely the Government should welcome criticism and not pretend that any particular system of Government is its own most cherished offspring.

A few months ago amongst some more serious cases of blackmail and misconduct by policemen, the London papers reported a case in which a policeman, apparently wearing plain clothes, entered a public-house, within a moment or two of the official closing hour and offered those present a drink. Although a stranger, his generous offer was accepted; a moment or two afterwards, in accordance with the standard of hospitality and generosity to which, in England, the so-called lower classes nearly always respond—a habit of which this disguised policeman must have been aware and perhaps reckoned on—he, in his turn, was offered refreshment by one of the party, which he accepted, though the hand of the clock had crept past the hour. Afterwards this policeman appeared as the principal evidence against the publican and the persons concerned for having permitted drinking after hours! The natural inference is that he was sent there as a ‘ trap ’.

Now we used to hear, years ago, of the shameless system of paid spies and inciters-to-mischief and *agents-provocateurs* employed by certain insecure, discredited and generally despicable Governments in Bulgaria, Russia and other supposedly backward and contemptible countries; and we used to thank heaven that, at least in this respect, we were not as these other men were.

Why have we changed all that now! Have our Indian police methods crept homeward and contaminated the decency of our English policemen? Has Satanism practised in Lucknow and Lahore come home to roost in London? The Nemesis of Empire indeed!

Why have our ruling classes who control the police and who lately put a General to control Scotland Yard and sent a Rear-Admiral to help him, permitted this shabby thing to invade us, to spread into a body of men, like our English police, who, in the main, probably dislike this sort of behaviour as much as does any honest man? Can we trust these people, who can tolerate this sort of thing in England, to control and improve the Police Services in India?

We hear constantly of English policemen, disguised as 'swells', drinking champagne with smart prostitutes in London night-clubs—at great expense to the public—in order, apparently, that their shining example may encourage other people to do likewise, who can be then convicted of some misdemeanour or breach of the Licensing Laws. Our rulers must be fools not to see that such conduct by the police is disastrous because it brings all law into contempt.

A respectable shop-assistant has had, he declares, to bribe the police on more than one occasion to prevent himself being arrested on some charge of indecency because he has been sitting with his arm round the waist of his fiancée. When you ask him why, if he had not been committing any indecency, he did not have the pluck to refuse to bribe the policeman, his answer is really unanswerable. Both he and his sweetheart are employés in well-known firms whose Heads would regard with grave annoyance and suspicion any charge, however ill-founded it might eventually prove to be, laid against any of their subordinates by the police—especially one of improper behaviour, even if it were eventually rebutted: MUD STICKS TO INDIVIDUALS—INSTITUTIONS can ignore it. While the case was pending—supposing that the young employé had the temerity to declare that the policeman was lying—or attempting to extort blackmail—some of the smartest police-officers in London would perhaps be mobilized to make ‘ discreet inquiries ’. The inquiries would be carried on for perhaps several weeks at public expense. An endeavour might be made to unearth something detrimental—some past peccadillo—and who is there in the world that wishes to run the gauntlet of publicity and innuendo for every incident in the whole of their past career? Not one! Uniformed policemen would probably visit the offices where these young folk worked to inquire of their superior concerning their general character—or they would visit their modest suburban homes and cause scandal and gossip in the street. Moreover, such is the stupidity of our governing class that the policeman's evidence would almost certainly be believed by the magistrate; in which case dismissal from their employment and possibly ruin waits for these two young folk, however untrue or, what is much more likely—exaggerated—the policeman's accusation may be; for there are as many prudes and 'Nosey Parkers' and 'Peeping Toms' in the Police Force as outside of it. At the best, even if acquitted of the charge, the strain, publicity and expense might easily so unsettle and disturb the persons concerned that they might afterwards lose their job for some quite other reason; and they would doubtless realize that to have proved a policeman guilty of perjury is not likely to make any other member of the Force specially lenient towards you in any future trouble. Considering all things, the innocent accused would be indeed fools if they did not consent—while our magistrates continue to be so prejudiced and lazy—and our employing class so illogical—to bribe every policeman who held out his hand—in their position in life there is nothing else to be done! And of course the police know it!

The magistrate, when he is tackled on this subject, rides off on the usual sophistry. He thinks it 'very likely that the young couple were misbehaving'. He did 'much the same himself' when he was a youngster at Oxford, and in any case, it destroys the morale of the police, so he declares 'when the magistrates do not accept their evidence'. Incidentally the magistrate feels quite honestly that his disbelief might unjustly imperil a young and promising constable's chances of promotion. For disbelief implies carelessness or perjury on the policeman's part!

Now, if this state of affairs can exist—and we all know it can and does exist in England—where the guns of an omnipotent Press and Parliament are often trained upon the police—how can we imagine that our governing class have not got it into a worse tangle in India, where not only is there no all-powerful Parliament and Press, but the whole British Government is in such a false position that, in effect, it is depending for its very existence on the goodwill and favour of the Police Force!

It is no discredit to any police force, or to any individual policeman, to say that the very nature of their duties—repression and detection—must inevitably attract those inclined to domineer and to sneak; and that if a man have latent in his nature the qualities that create a bully or a spy, the very exercise of a policeman's duties can hardly fail to develop them. This is as inevitable as the fact that the glitter of a cavalry regiment and the nature of a cavalryman's duties appeal most often to young men who like swagger and sport and a position in which their social precedence does not depend entirely on work and intellectual attainments.

In India, as in England, the unsupported testimony of ' policemen ' ought never to be accepted, except in cases of violence, cruelty and dishonesty, where the damage is obvious and there is no likelihood of error. To use these blue-coated Guardians of the Peace, whether in India or in England, for purposes of enforcing standards of personal behaviour, or for altering or improving taste or private morals or anything of that kind, is merely to ask for perjury, blackmail and oppression, and for what is far worse—the ultimate demoralization of the Police Force itself. We have seen this demoralization going on in India, where these ‘ yokels in blue coats ’ have been supposedly attempting to put into force that frightful but well-meant engine of Draconian oppression, the Indian Penal Code.

We are asking too much of these very ordinary men who are policemen all the world over, whether they be Sikh policemen in Rangoon or Irishmen in New York, or English countrymen in Piccadilly. Neither the pay of the Police Force nor its duties are likely to attract philosophers and scientists or even judicially-minded philanthropists—quite the contrary. It is too easy to exploit moral prohibition, and the wreckage of the Law in the United States and the blackmail in India and the loss of confidence in the police in London has been the natural result of putting an unfair temptation in the way of these very young and all-too-powerful officials. In matters of moral discrimination we must expect little of the police—and arrange their responsibilities accordingly. This conclusion, to an upper-class Englishman, may have all the demerits of being logical, but unfortunately it has the merits of being proved to be a fact by experience, whether in India or elsewhere.

§ 3. *Opium and Prisons*

Commonly we English, being intolerant and unimaginative, compound ' for sins we are inclined to by damning those we have no mind to '. The tendency to compound and to damn increases when one is in a position to treat grown-up people as if they were naughty and vicious children.

There is, for instance, the question of Opium in India versus Whisky.

It is, we consider, very depraved to take opium, even in moderation. On the contrary it is a fine manly thing to drink whisky, even though it results directly or indirectly in ill-temper, or ill-health that may require six months' recuperation in Europe at the expense of the Indian Taxpayer!

The consumption of whisky benefits the English distiller, and numbers of other Englishmen engaged in its sale and distribution; but opium, so we are told, is a much more insidious and dangerous drug. Whisky excites certain types into a quarrelsome mood, sometimes into homicidal fury. Opium makes people drowsy and incompetent. It may be hard to choose between them; but one wonders whether, if opium were grown in England and whisky only manufactured by Bolsheviks or Indians, we should have so much tolerance for whisky and so much stern moral disapprobation for opium.

Indians and Burmans living in the depths of malarious jungles anything from thirty to three hundred miles from a doctor, are forbidden to possess opium!

These people have been accustomed for generations, when travelling through the jungle, to keep small quantities of opium for use. Usually it is packed under the finger-nail, and from time to time the finger is sucked. The minute doses of opium thus taken undoubtedly mitigate attacks of fever—especially malignant forms of malarial fever—and in some cases probably prevent or cut short the attacks. It is well known in Europe that opium can be decidedly useful in certain types of malaria and hill-diarrhœa and dysentery.

But this practice of the natives was a technical breach of the Englishman's laws against opium. So the ignorant, fever-ridden wretches would be stopped on the jungle roads by some policeman and arrested. Doubtless in many cases they refused to bribe the policeman, and admitted having opium under their finger-nail or in their pouches. If they had had a whole bottle of whisky or gin they would have been permitted to pass.

So they would be marched many miles through the jungle to the nearest prison, a white-washed barrack full of strange people who did not even understand the prisoner's dialect; a terrifying place to a man who had spent all his life chattering freely with his kind in a tree-hut or wigwam amidst the hills and forests of the Chino-Burmese frontier.

And there in prison these ' criminals ' would be likely to remain; unless and until their families bought them out by bribing the gaolers. Their ignorance and jungle habits would cause them constantly to break unwittingly the strict prison rules drawn up by some excellent Anglo-Saxon from Dulwich. Each breach of prison rules would mean the extension of their sentence by two or three days. Can anyone imagine a more terrifying experience?

A prisoner, whose total vocabulary consisted perhaps of only one hundred and fifty words of Kachin, Shan, Yaw-Yin or some other hill dialect, would be brought in heavily chained hand and foot to receive additional punishment. What was the charge? He had been found concealing illegal weapons; and secondly he had soiled the piece of coarse prison canvas he wore as clothing round his loins.

The poor creature, aged about twenty-five, squats on the floor with his hands held up together in a position of abject supplication to the governor of the prison and the line of gaolers attending to give 'evidence' against him.

You ask to see the illegal weapon. A wooden match-stem one and a half inches long and perhaps one-eighth of an inch thick is handed to you. The 'criminal' had found it, and with amazing depravity he had bent it double and had been seen in his cell using it as a pair of tweezers to pull out the superfluous hair on his chin and arms!

And the second offence? On the rough cloth around his waist was a yellowish brown stain. You examine it. Quite obviously it is due to the rubbing of the iron chains he or some previous prisoner had worn.

Much to the scandal of the chief warder, who had supposed you were feeling the heat too much to investigate the charges very carefully, the prisoner is let off with a warning. For once he is not given the usual two days' extra imprisonment for a breach of prison rules.

You learn that the wretch is in prison for having been found in the jungle with opium in his pouch; and that his original sentence has been already served; but that it has been ' extended ' for minor breaches of prison discipline. Evidently his relations in the jungle have forgotten to ' interview ' the chief warder sufficiently often.

The prisoner, to whom English, Burmese and Hindustani are all equally unintelligible, can scarcely understand the charges against him, much less their import. The interpreter, himself one of the gaolers, is shifty, illiterate and eminently unsatisfactory.

It would not be a bad thing if the Viceroy could, like Haroun-al-Raschid, disguise himself and do a few days' work as a doctor in a Cantonment Hospital or as a governor in one of the small gaols in the remoter parts of India. He might learn a thing or two, and be less inclined afterwards to believe everything he hears at Simla.

§ 4. *Hunger in the Making*

Incredible as it sounds, it is possible to see at Karachi and other Indian ports shiploads of grain leaving for Europe at a time when large provinces of India are in the grip of scarcity or even of real famine.

Since 1906, scarcity or famine have been almost annual occurrences in one part or another of India. Quite apart from this the average native of India is habitually under-fed—he has no physiological reserve, and in consequence offers no resistance to the march of disease. It is a question whether under present conditions any foodstuffs should be allowed to leave India. Not only are human beings under-fed, but the feeding of stock is so poor that the land is starved of manure.

The explanation of this export of grain is itself a confirmation of India's extreme poverty. However high the price of grain in India may appear to the Indian, it will always fetch a still higher price at any Mediterranean port owing to the great difference between the standard of living in India and even the poorest countries of Europe.

It may be natural that the wealthier nations should in this way exploit the poorer, but hardly to the extent of depriving them of food necessary for bare subsistence.

It is claimed that however much the Indians may suffer, this export of grain is necessary in order to ' keep up the rate of monetary exchange '—not a very convincing reason to Indians half-starved in mud-walled villages in Central India!

But it is urged that the grain exported indirectly pays the interest on loans which the Government of India has borrowed, or balances purchases of English manufactured goods ordered by Indian

Government Departments! Such an explanation only aggravates the offence.

Clearly if the Indian rate of exchange fell India as a whole could afford to buy less English manufactures, and less particularly of Manchester piece goods and other fabrics. That is an argument in favour of India making her own cloth from her own cotton, and not an argument to prove it is necessary to export foodstuffs that may reduce the cost of living in Italy and Greece while the Indian has insufficient food.

The Indians employed in loading these ships have relatives in neighbouring provinces who, owing to the rise in the price of food, are living on the starvation border-line. Their feelings as they watch these ships leaving for Europe or when they see train-loads of grain passing their scanty fields towards the coast on railways whose shareholders are mainly English can be imagined. Must it not all appear as a gigantic and diabolical conspiracy to make their hard life even harder? Would not English country-folk feel the same? They would probably derail the trains unless their Government quickly put a stop to such a mockery. Can this feeling explain the attempts that are sometimes made in India to derail trains? Railways must appear to an Indian to be rather like huge iron suckers taking the corn out of the country for Europe.

Anyone who has watched the terrible progress of a famine in India cannot but feel ashamed of our reckless stupidity in allowing foodstuffs to be openly exported. Any race with less of the ox-like patience of the Indian would have rebelled. And yet we pretend they are a troublesome people to govern! Is this one of the reasons why we dare not let them have arms to guard their cattle?

The soil of large tracts in India is poor, and must, unless exportation of foodstuffs is prohibited, become poorer still. Obviously everything that is taken out of the land must be put back again either in the form of animal manure or by the use of more costly chemical dressings. A hundred or even fifty years of grain exportation without heavy manurial return will very seriously impoverish any soil. What can have induced the Indian Government to imagine that only in India can you keep on taking what you do not return? An analysis of the soil made to-day, if it could be compared with one made in the reign of Shah Jehan or at some previous time, would probably—almost certainly—disclose a progressive reduction in the fertilizing content. The Indian problem—whoever rules India—will always remain very largely an agricultural one.

The increasing cost of food in India has greater social effects than in Europe because there is no margin of ' luxury expenditure ' to cut, to meet the added cost of necessities. Thus it forces all sorts and conditions of men, women, and children to compete fiercely against one another in the industrial Labour Market; though so many of them are too young, too ill-fed or too feeble to be fit to labour in a factory. This competition naturally suits those who are establishing great mills and factories in India; factories which must eventually compete in the markets of the world with English products. The increased cost of food by reducing ‘ real ’ wages in India intensifies this competition—we are already being punished indirectly for our inhuman stupidity.

Remembering what industrialized England became, it is not pleasant to watch now the industrialization of India. The miseries and slumdom of Glasgow and Oldham will be combined with the heat and pitiful destitution of India. It will not be a pleasing mixture. And this will take place without the ameliorating influences which have lately been started in Europe, in a country without adequate and suitable systems of relief for destitution, and whose present Governors would regard active Trade Unionism as ‘ sedition ’, and treat it accordingly!

Another stupidity is the common practice of trying to replace native methods by introducing expensive apparatus from Europe. Here is one instance typical of many:

It was the custom throughout India for the roads to be watered by native water-carriers, each of whom carried a surprisingly large leathern sack full of water. These ‘ Bhisties ’, as the water-carriers are called, are men trained from boyhood in the art of water-carrying. The roads were watered cheaply and on the whole quite efficiently by this ancient method, which, whatever its drawbacks, was quite as good a method as a poor country like India could afford. The pay of these men would probably not exceed fourpence or sixpence a day; on this small sum they would maintain themselves and their family, and often, wonderful as it sounds, several decrepit and unfortunate relations as well.

But the English officials, who form the Cantonment Committees and who can put pressure on Municipalities, decided that English water-carts should be purchased in England, and the water-carriers dismissed. Thus the roads would be more efficiently watered—ignoring the fact that the dismissed water-carriers and their families in a country like India must either take to crime or starve.

So the water-carts eventually arrived from Wolverhampton, and some dozen or more Indian families in every Cantonment are reduced to destitution in a land without any adequate system of poor-relief.

Naturally the water-carts and their transport provided profits for the manufacturer and the railways and shipping companies, all of them mainly or entirely English concerns. Naturally, too, taxes and octroi duties had to be increased to pay for these expensive iron carts, thus actually adding to the cost of the food of the destitute water-carriers. For this and other reasons discontent with British rule increases, so that the already large and expensive police force must be increased and still further taxation imposed to pay for the increase. A vicious circle indeed!

Quite innocently the English Commissioner would argue that the water-carriers would never have realized that they were paying two or three times over for the benefit of the Wolverhampton manufacturer unless some wicked 'Nationalist Agitator' had told them about it! It would be humorous if it were not all so tragically stupid. He should know that an empty stomach is a most eloquent counsellor and logician!

The fact that any capital outlay leaves the country or district from which the money is drawn in the form of taxation must in a poor agricultural country be always an overwhelming objection to the purchase of costly modern appliances, unless they are absolutely essential; especially as these in a climate such as India so soon deteriorate unless most carefully watched. Even if the machinery is purchased from some distant province in India, there is still the cruelty of displacing labour which can find no other outlet or adequate assistance. Wages spent in the area are more important than an increased efficiency in a service that is not absolutely essential.

Much the same can be said regarding our expenditure in other directions. Obviously it is less impoverishing to have a higher rate of taxation if practically the whole of the taxes thus raised are spent in the neighbourhood, than a lower rate of which a large proportion of the proceeds leaves the district or the country. This is the answer to those who contend that English Government cannot possibly have impoverished India as much as the Government of the Mogul Emperors.

Whatever the amount that was raised by the Mogul Emperors, it is certain that nearly the whole of it was spent again in India. Probably the larger part never got past the pockets of the local tax-collectors and their satellites. A smaller but constant external drain on any community will have far more disastrous results than lavish extravagance inside the boundaries of its territory, especially in the case of a country like India that supplies most, if not all, of its own essential needs.

The yearly drain on India for English pensions, for the purchase of English manufactures, the payment of dividends, as well as the large sums remitted home every year by the many thousands of Englishmen employed in one capacity or another and paid on what by Indian standards is a very high scale, must be considerable. Statisticians quote a gigantic figure—but whatever the figure may be, the fact that it is considerable and has been repeated year after year at an increasing rate for well over a hundred years, must have much to do with India's appalling poverty. It is the old story of ' Tribute '.

Certainly some service is rendered in return, but from the Indian point of view it is service monstrously over-paid, and in any case it represents services which India in her present condition cannot possibly afford. Silk clothing may be the warmest, but a beggar prefers a cotton suit and a dinner!

The Irish contend that this payment of Tribute was one of the principal causes of Ireland's decline, another being that as in India so in Ireland, the ruling country—England—is constantly tempted to suppress or hamper any rival industries that may spring up in the dependent country.

Although the denunciation by ' Manchester ' Liberals of the shameful labour conditions in Indian cotton mills is more than justified, it is ingeniously countered by the argument that the moral indignation is stimulated more by the fear of competition by the underpaid labour than by a disinterested sense of decency and humanity.

§ 5. *Punitive Police*

India is larger, more thickly populated and almost as various, though scarcely as disunited, as modern Europe; yet people in England will ask why Indians ill-treat one another. They might as well ask why 'Europeans' ill-treat and fight with each other.

It is too easy to find Greeks and Bulgarians ready to intimidate, blackmail and ill-treat Serbians and Roumanians. Our recent experience in Ireland proves it is only too easy to find Irishmen ready to ill-treat horribly or even to murder other Irishmen; yet we do not hear these facts quoted as a proof that Europe is a collection of half-civilized and degraded 'natives' unfit for self-government.

A police official will tell you that he has hardly a single Indian police sergeant (thanadar) who does not permit the torturing of native prisoners in his police station (thana). He suggests that it is perhaps just as well that the Hindus should realize what bullies their own police can be, and then they will be less inclined to grumble at British rule in India. But the bullying by the Indian police to this extent is, of course, only possible because they have behind them the bayonets of the very efficient British Army in India.

Doubtless prisoners are ill-treated in many French, Bulgarian, and other Continental prisons, but that is not indirectly due to the immunity from reprisals on the police being assured by the presence of a Foreign Army of Occupation.

You ask perhaps if this torturing and ill-treatment in Indian police stations cannot be reduced? The answer you get is characteristic: ' I suppose we police officers ought to try more to have it stopped—but I really haven't either the time or the inclination to watch all my police sergeants and subordinates—all I want is to get a game or two of polo a week, some leave to Kashmir, and finally to get my pension and get out of this stinking country.'

Another police official will explain what can be done, and often was done (and I suppose still is) to subdue the resistance of villagers when they become troublesome to the Powers that be.

A certain number of punitive police would be quartered on each house in each of the refractory villages; they would do very much as they liked. ' I give you my word that after some of my punitive police have been stationed in a village for a few days the spirit of the toughest of the political agitators is broken.'

' How? '

' Well, they will help themselves to everything! Within twenty-four hours there will not be a virgin or four anna piece (about sixpence) left in that village!'

He will admit that these punitive police help to give the whole Police Force a bad name, but police officers do not think it a desirable thing that the Police Force should be too friendly with the people. *An unpopular police force would be bound to remain loyal in the case of another mutiny.* The punitive police were a separate force—a 'tough lot' recruited for this duty from an area having perhaps a traditional dislike of the villagers, their religion and everything about them.

Afterwards I heard many times the same blunt boast concerning the lawless behaviour of these punitive police particularly as regards women and looting. Certainly reports in the newspapers of the reprisals in Bengal, although censored, showed that this was not merely loose talk.

Undoubtedly the Black and Tans in Ireland were the lineal descendants—politically speaking—of the punitive police we had been employing for so many years in India. Tricks learnt in India come home twenty years afterwards to roost. Bengal and Balbriggan are not as far apart as they look on the map!

'Indian methods' in police administration have been or are being tried in Egypt, Palestine, East Africa, Arabia, and even much nearer home. Burma and Singapore and Hong Kong know all about the misbehaviour of the avaricious and corrupt Sikh policeman we have introduced to 'keep order'.

Mr. Ghandi has complained of the ' Satanism ' of English methods in India. He can comfort himself that we learnt it there, and that it is nothing to the ' Satanism ' which the supposed necessity of holding down India has gradually introduced into English policy at home, in Europe, and in our other tropical dependencies.

§ 6. *Politically Equal but Socially Incompatible?*

It will be objected that the coloured races have now a tendency towards ' getting above themselves '.

Officers and others returning from India and East Africa are emphatic sometimes on this point—their mentality, in fact their whole outlook, gets changed very rapidly in the ' Garrison ' atmosphere of our tropical dependencies.

No doubt the assertion of complete political equality by individuals whom one considers—rightly or wrongly—are socially, morally, or mentally one's inferiors is always trying to put up with. But after all there are many countries in Europe to which English people invite themselves, where the inhabitants, though politically speaking equal and even more than equal—since they are in their own country—are in our estimation socially, morally or intellectually our inferiors. But whether one invites oneself to—shall we say— France or Italy or any other country, it is necessary to keep one's conviction of personal superiority carefully concealed, unless one is anxious to be hurried ignominiously over the nearest frontier.

If Englishmen could only be persuaded to behave towards the Indian and the Egyptian and the Chinaman with even half the civility they would HAVE to show towards a Greek or an Albanian, there would be no trouble in India. It is our futile and entirely unmaintainable sense of personal ownership and dominion that leads to the brazen display of our superiority-complex in Asia and Africa.

During the South African War certain English officers displayed their ' superiority ' so aggressively that the Australian troops in Cape Town were driven into an almost mutinous display of ' independence ', a coming event that cast a somewhat lengthy shadow in advance.

Political equality in India must be absolute, but because there is so much incompatibility, social intercourse between the two races must for a long time be very restricted—and for the good of both races it ought to be restricted, if only to avoid friction.

The attitude of the white man in East Africa has become dangerously like the attitude of his brother in India. ' Judges ', one is told, ' are bound more or less to take a white man's word against a native's, so it is possible to give a native a hiding provided there were no native witnesses present, and no marks are left; or at any rate no serious injury is done—it is better to have another European present who could swear the native's behaviour had been provocative, or had insulted the British uniform or flag—in any case a Judge would probably get the cold shoulder at the club afterwards, if he tried any pro-native tricks.' This was said of East Africa, but it might so easily have been said of India.

Individuals who talk and act in this way fail to realize that the British Empire depends for its existence on obtaining the consent and the friendly co-operation of the races governed. At present we offer a military and political advantage to anyone who declares war on us; and we make the premature breaking up of the British Empire a certainty. They are the real Bolsheviks who encourage an attitude of mind that must provoke Bolshevism and discontent in others.

§ 7. *The Indian Millstone*

How many times in the last twenty or thirty years has English policy in Europe and elsewhere been seriously deflected and incommoded by our having had to keep in mind the possibility of having to despatch at short notice troops to subdue native risings in Egypt, India, China or elsewhere?

The submarine has come to stay; and thus every country with a coast-line between Southampton and Bombay could make things seriously unpleasant for our troopships. Were Egypt and India contented and friendly we could take a more honest and unbiased line in Europe. We might even, if we wanted to (and that day may come), snap our fingers at any military Dictator who might establish himself on the shores of the Mediterranean—there are already three of them!

It is not only that we have to pay their price for benevolent neutrality to the nations that lie along the flank of the route over which troops for our 'nigger-killing-expeditions' must travel—there are other penalties we have to pay.

Every year a stream of returning officials and business men come back to England to enjoy their pension and retirement. They come back imbued with contempt for labourers as mere 'coolies'. Many of these pensioners have become accustomed to exercise almost autocratic control over brown, yellow, half-caste or black employees. They have become schooled in the subtleties and evasions of bureaucratic Absolutism, and inured to the poverty and misery so common in India and the East. They are careless and callous about methods they would have considered barbarous when, as young men, they first left Sandhurst or Oxford or their local Grammar School. It is these men who often have local influence. Can this explain the present tension in England between the well-to-do and 'the coolies'?

§ 8. *The Cult of Racialism and Exclusiveness*

No one who has lived and worked amongst the English people can have anything but respect and affection for the great mass of patient working and middle-class folk who form the vast majority of the English nation. Their only fault is that they are rather too patient with imposition, too ‘ respectful ’ to their self-styled ‘ superiors ’. And when anyone dares to approach a member of the governing class in India or in England and suggests that they might moderate a little of their arrogance and pretensions, one has hurled at his head quotations from that prophet of Racial Pride, Mr. Rudyard Kipling.

Pride, we are told, is one of the Seven Deadly Sins. It was Pride that flung Satan over the starry balcony of Heaven. Accompanied, no doubt, with his troublesome load he found, according to Milton, foothold on this planet and has left at least a fair share of his special weakness in the British Islands. It was Milton—beguiled by his own fancy—who afterwards invented—‘ God’s Englishman ’!

There are some kinds of pride, such as those which a man may take in his own accomplishments against heavy odds, which have some justification, but pride of Race is certainly one of the least justifiable, one that needs the least encouragement. One does, indeed, meet Englishmen who have personal pride in the fact that they were born of a certain stock, but as their birth in a certain house and on a certain island depended entirely on the health of their mother and the skill of the midwife and not in the least upon their own efforts, this, to most people, appears ludicrous. We meet others in our upper classes who are proud because they were at a certain Public School, or put into a certain regiment! But once a boy is put into Eton, the money for which is being found by his father or his grandmother, and not by himself, he must be extremely unlucky or unusually dishonest if he be not allowed to remain there. If he be honest he will admit that it was mainly the Army ' crammer ' and his father's bank book that got him into the ' 31st Hussars ' and largely an absence of competition and the unexacting nature of the duties that has made it possible for him to remain in that ' distinguished ' regiment.

A great English poet denounced those who prostituted their gifts ' to heap the shrine of pride with incense kindled at the Muse's flame '; but Mr. Rudyard Kipling knew better than the poet Gray and certainly must have found his writing more profitable. It is Mr. Kipling who has reminded his countrymen that undoubtedly ' ye are the people '—the people to rule with a rod of iron the ' lesser tribes without the Law '! The ' Law ' they are ' without ' would seem to include not only the Law of Fair Contract—as witness the shameful Opium Treaty with China—but such necessary laws as, for instance, Habeas Corpus, not to mention the Sermon on the Mount.

It was this writer who became lyrical concerning the war for the Transvaal gold mines—the ignominious Boer War; when the whole British Empire mobilized against 50,000 farmers who dared aspire to independence, and it was this writer who irresponsibly informed young Englishmen going East that in Asia ‘ there ain’t no Ten Commandments ’. Mr. Kipling’s astounding statement has been translated into French and Italian, and it is not only young Englishmen now who pass down the Red Sea with the comfortable conviction that there are no longer Ten Prohibitions to consider. It is true, indeed, that there are not, in Asia, ‘ Ten Commandments ’—for most of the Asiatic religions have at least twenty, including prohibitions amongst other things against strong drink, against the killing of animals for sport—and in some cases even for food—besides the most stringent admonitions concerning the necessity of being ‘ merciful to your enemies ’—even to defeated Germans, Irish ‘ traitors ’ and ‘ mutinous ’ sepoys! And there are commandments, too, concerning the necessity of ‘ right-thinking ’ and of cleansing the body before prayer and of washing the hands before taking food, a by no means superfluous admonition even in our enlightened island.

But the young Englishman going East—who has perhaps already found the ten prohibitions rather more than enough in England—was naturally only too ready to believe Mr. Kipling, only too delighted to hear, being sick of prohibitions in England, that there were none in Asia! So to this very day they go off in shiploads to the East to act accordingly, much to the astonishment and indignation of the Asiatic—and, it is only fair to say, to the embarrassment of the smug Christian propagandists that we also export to Asia—our religion, like our inferior brands of whisky and gin, having become now mainly an article of export.

How much brutality and crime and embarrassment to our administrators in the East have these hasty and inaccurate lines been responsible for in the last thirty-five years? It scarcely bears thinking about.

It was this writer, too, who familiarized us, who were regular soldiers, with a coarse, drunken, not very scrupulous and foul-mouthed Hooligan whom he imagined to be the British private soldier! The writer has served as a private soldier and lived in barracks, and though continence and abstinence were not present in any very remarkable degree, he thinks the effect of Mr. Kipling's description, which became so popular, was to suggest to many soldiers that they were apparently expected to behave in a way from which they had hitherto rather refrained. It was a Guards officer and not an admirer who said that if you constantly told your men that they were 'gentlemen' of the Guard they would be more likely to behave than if you quoted this poet to them.

In some verses called 'Lest We Forget' Mr. Kipling, with becoming humility, would associate the Spirit of Goodness with the cunning and duplicity of Clive and his forged Treaty, and with the slaughter of Frenchmen at Quebec. But he could go one better even than this. A certain dark and terrible Character once led a Young Man—an Idealist—up on to a high mountain and promised

Him on certain conditions ‘ the Kingdom of the Earth ’. He was suitably repulsed. Covetousness and land-hunger and Empire greed and racial pride and the domination-complex scarcely need in these days any ‘ incense kindled at the Muse’s flame ’. It is, on the contrary, an uphill battle now for all of us to get any nation to drop its intense Nationalism and to consider the needs and feelings of the others. But Mr. Kipling would lead the young Englishman up to a point of vantage and declare to him that if he would be only sufficiently a thruster and sufficiently a gambler—after Mr. Kipling’s own heart—he would then, as a reward, obtain not only ‘ the whole earth ’—but ‘ everything that is in it ’! What was to happen to the possessions and the freedom and the self-respect of the remaining sixteen hundred million human beings on this planet when the young Englishman had secured the coveted prize, this writer did not explain. The Latin races and the Americans and all the others are no doubt still anxiously inquiring. Perhaps the League of Nations will order an expurgated edition of this Anthem to be circulated.

But Mr. Kipling has done us another service; he tactfully reminded the Americans that they were but shabby debt-collectors without too much conscience—but he omitted to mention that the Americans had taken not an inch of territory and that we had collected, as the result of ‘ a War to save Belgium ’, over one million square miles of additional territory; which, were it worth but three English pounds per acre, would represent some ten thousand millions of dollars. It is true that we still call these huge areas Mandates, but how many of these Mandates would Mr. Kipling's friends be ready to restore to the natives who occupy them or to Turkey or Germany from whom they were taken?

It will be urged that much of these Territories consists of sandy wastes, and it will be forgotten that sandy wastes when irrigated can be profitable and that the oil of Mosul and the rich farms of German East Africa, some of which have been sold at prices exceeding forty pounds an acre, must be taken into account. Even a sandy waste in a territory which forms a bridge between the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa and a vantage point over the sea communications between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean may be invaluable as an aeroplane centre, and desolate and rocky inlets of the sea provide protection for submarines and other naval craft whose action might determine the result of the next Great War-to-End-War.

The Prophet of Racialism has many admirers in the Press, that is almost entirely owned by the governing class of Great Britain. One of these newspapers not so very long ago found it necessary to say that the children who attended the Elementary Schools of Great Britain ' would get nothing more into their heads at these schools but what would have to be afterwards removed with a fine toothcomb '! What remark could have been more calculated at that time to raise hostility between the parents of those four million children, the seventy thousand teachers who teach them on the one hand,

and the class which this newspaper presumably represents? A more insulting, mean and calculated attempt to disparage education for the poor and to raise disaffection and ill-feeling between different classes of His Majesty's subjects could hardly be conceived. But if anyone attempts to criticize the small minority who approve of and read this paper and who look down with such superb contempt on their fellow-countrymen and on the rest of the earth, there is scarcely any limit to their unscrupulous bitterness, or bounds to their fury. They, controlling the wealth and power of England, whose brothers and sons are the judges and the barristers and the chief constables and the prison governors of Great Britain, will stop at nothing, not even the sanctity of the Law, to persecute some wretched workman or some comparatively poor person who ridicules their pretentions. They control the Press with its thousand possibilities of libel and calumny, insinuation and innuendo. It is this class that knows only too well, because their brothers and their sons are Judges, that a Judge is often but a barrister in a red gown, by no means shorn of the political passions and personal prejudices or the complaisant ambitions which he had as a practising barrister; they know too that a policeman is often not very much more than a yokel in a blue coat, quite ready to embroider evidence if tempted with promotion, and to curry favour with the governing classes. Thus it is that few, until it is too late, have the courage to tell the truth about anything, and, in consequence, the whole national life becomes demoralized, and corruption is found within a few months in our Foreign Office, in the Police Force and on a gigantic scale in the City. Our Bishops defy the Law and our Admirals create mutiny—while our trade languishes and our foreign policy becomes even more inept than usual—we are to be bankrupt to save the *amour propre*—the conceit of the Traditionalists.

How, indeed, can we expect the truth to be encouraged in England, or expect the Indians to believe we speak the truth, when an English General informs the American public—and all the world—that he himself faked photographs of German atrocities—photographs that formed excellent propaganda against the Germans—a propaganda that very largely helped us to win the war! By winning the war we smashed, for the time being, German competition, destroyed her Fleet and Merchant marine, and gained control over the German Colonies and much of the Turkish Dominions.

So lying really does pay!

Then in such a case why pretend that anyone in England or in India or in America or in the Councils of Europe should ever be expected to speak the truth, or why punish anyone for not doing so?

If the cynical aggression upon the Boer Republics prepared the cynicism which brought about the Great War, then equally the 'success' of lying propaganda during the war has prepared the road for a moral debacle in human history the like of which has never yet been witnessed, and of which our troubles in India are but a premonitory symptom. It is the lack of truth that is our curse. It is not the horror and bloodshed of war that matters—there is plenty of bloodshed and plenty of horror in a London hospital—it is the hideous moral declension that follows. It is not the bloodstained blades of bayonets nor the scattered entrails of our poor human bodies that matter; it is the broken morale and the triumph of hatred and untruthfulness over human sympathy and human reason that is the real horror—the real disaster.

The writer, like most of his class, was brought up to admire the fierce Jewish maxims in praise of war which the English upper classes have adopted as their own. The Fighting Forces of the Crown were, he was told, the most honourable of the Professions. They certainly in England are the most honoured. The most unobservant can but notice that the streets of our capital City are decorated mainly, not with the statues of poets and doctors, engineers and philosophers, artists and philanthropists, but with the uniformed symbols of successful ' War '.

' By their Gods ye shall know them.' Why do our governing classes pretend that they have any sympathy for the abolition of War—when in private the idea is so often ridiculed? Many, if not most of them, *do* believe in war—and why should they not, seeing that it provides their sons and brothers with ' honourable ' careers and has added millions of square miles to dominions over which more of their sons and brothers will presently go out to rule as police commissioners, judges and lieutenant-governors?

Let us face the music! Our governing classes, from a selfish point of view, are entirely justified. Brutalized at their schools and assured of comfortable official billets by a successful war—*they* will never in their hearts give up war. We must either bury the hope of peace in Europe and in Asia or change the mentality of our ruling classes or drive them from our path.

To be a gentleman in England one need not, nay, one must not be gentle, for gentleness in our Public Schools has a sex—it is but feminine—a rather despised sex. We show gentleness only to the sex from whom we hope to get some emotional, sentimental or sensual return. Why waste it on one another? And why waste it—of all people—on the Hindu? It is more manly, we pretend, for the young English gentleman not to be gentle. The very worst insult that can be thrown at an English boy of the upper classes at his Public School is to call him ' Gentle Jesus '! This fact alone is eloquent. Perhaps, after all, we might as well ' roll up the map of Asia ' and prepare for the coming strife between the classes and masses in England.

Yet there are some signs that a change is taking place amongst the minority who lost us America and Ireland and South Africa and that they will not be allowed to lose us India.

We simply cannot afford even to risk losing our Indian trade.

And trade in India, as elsewhere, depends on

Good Will: so we can only keep that trade by beginning to behave like Gentlemen in Asia in the unconventional sense of that word, and cease acting there like successful and self-righteous pirates.

Our governing classes—or perhaps one should say their organs in the Press—portray the most curious lack both of humour and logic. One great Conservative journal declared that the hands of the then English Prime Minister were 'slimy with treachery'. Within a short time the same journal denounces with rage and fury the Indians and the Egyptians for not implicitly trusting the rather nebulous promises of the same Prime Minister and the Members of his Cabinet! Could inconsequential unreason go further?

It was a Frenchman who, though an admirer of the English success, declared that what puzzled his countrymen was the fact that one-third of the English nation was always so busy making the other two-thirds uncomfortable, and that we were so suspicious of one another—was he referring to our police methods? But why on earth the Egyptians and the Hindus should be expected to consider us incapable of betraying *them* when we declare that our hands are 'slimy' with the betrayal of *one another*—Heaven only knows.

Perhaps the great English journal, with its huge circulation, did not mean what it said in cold print—an added cause of uncertainty for the Egyptian and the Hindu, and the Frenchman with his lingering reminiscences of 'Perfide Albion'. The puerile unreason of a Third Form at our

Public Schools seems to be so often straying into the newspapers.

In *Out of Step*, Mr. Derek Walker Smith, speaking of post-war conditions, says: ‘ Few of the children of our Public School system escape being devoured by the Moloch of class-conscious Conservatism ’. He emphasizes the fact that the bullying at school causes far more mental than physical pain. The employee, even the private soldier, escape from their overseers for the greater part of each twenty-four hours—but a boy at a boarding-school may be exposed to taunts and indignities at almost any hour of the day or night —‘ compulsory cricket ’ is often more dreaded than the class-room—the mental suffering may be almost continuous. Other nations manage to be courageous and courteous, even to excel us in games and military leadership, without compulsory ‘ sports ’. Logically, therefore, our extraordinary insistence on compulsion, even in games, and our system of fagging and corporal punishment cannot be a necessity—our leadership, has actually declined since we adopted it so wholeheartedly! Yet the vested interests—and there are many—refuse to consider the possibility that this system destroys initiative, originality and variety, and is an anachronism in democratic England. But Nature and consequences are ruthlessly logical, even if the English upper classes—as Conservative Ministers remind us—hate logic.

CHAPTER EIGHT

'ROUGH ISLANDERS'

§ 1

THE suggestions at the end of the book, which are intended to bring about a policy of reconciliation and appeasement in India, even if they were all carried out, would not be effectual unless we can become accustomed to treating each other in England with more courtesy; unless, in fact, we change our manners.

' Vulgar abuse ' of one individual by another goes scot-free by English law. It is almost a pity that it is so, for it leads us to expect the Indians and other races to give it and us the same licence.

Rightly or wrongly the Army and the official classes set the standard of manners in England, and when one realizes how the officers in the Army speak of and treat one another, it is evident that it is quite unreasonable to expect them and those who imitate them to behave any better either to the Indian or to anyone else.

The infantry soldier is quite as clean in his habits —when the exigencies of his service permit—as any other class in the community. Probably he is cleaner, because he has no servants to wait on him or conveniences for cleansing such as a well-to-do person expects. Because he must march upon his feet and because his load and his boots are heavy, his feet are, through no fault of his own, often an offence to himself and to others. To hear a Cavalry officer with his nose in the air speaking in contemptuous disdain and insolent disgust of his comrades in the Infantry as ‘ the feet ’! is illuminating. Just in the same way an Army Service Corps officer will be spoken of to his face by the officers of a crack regiment as ‘ a bloody little grocer ’, and the doctor as a ‘ damned apothecary ’. An officer who happens to be a grade or two junior in rank is called to his face a ‘ wart ’; indeed he is lucky if an offensive adjective or two are not added. And this is how the ‘ gentlemen ’ of England treat one another! Where did they learn this astounding insolence towards those members of their own class whom they imagine to be unable to reply or in some way inferior? Why, at their Public Schools, of course.

A story often repeated in the English Army indicates the contempt which certain units appear to have for their comrades-in-arms. This contempt is largely based on supposed *social* superiority and not on superior military efficiency, which, in spite of constant subtle propaganda, those who have really served with a number of different units know does not necessarily exist. A Colonel commanding a regiment of Guards at Aldershot discovers on the march that ahead of him upon the road is a regiment of Infantry. He considers it is beneath his dignity to march behind any other regiment and sends forward by a junior officer to the Colonel commanding the regiment in front, the following message:

'Tell Colonel Blank to take his rabble off the road and make way for the Guards!'

The writer wondered when he first heard this story repeated with approval whether one of the qualifications of a Colonel in the Guards is to behave in an ungentlemanly and contemptuous manner to a brother officer—who was presumably of about equal rank and, things being as they were in those days, had almost certainly seen far more active service than the snob who sent him the message. But it is still a mark of rank in England to be rude—to show a sort of schoolboy Prefectorial contempt for as many of your fellow-countrymen as you dare.

During his first month on a British battleship, the writer became accustomed to seeing senior officers display an almost humorous want of self-control. By no means bad specimens, they would, after reminding the scurrying sailors of their rank and sometimes even of their distinguished ancestry, give vent to torrents of abuse because they had detected some oversight which concerned not the safety of the ship but paint, brasswork and varnish. A careful study of the twenty-second chapter of Leviticus revealed the fact that these delicate insinuations concerning the men and the habits of their mothers and fathers included practically every one of the 'peccadilloes' therein enumerated. This foul abuse could have but two explanations, either it was intended to insult a quite decent lot of one's fellow-Englishmen, who being subordinate must submit to the most exasperating abuse—'as a test of good discipline'—or else that it was a sheer want of self-control and that the references to these ' peccadilloes '—many of them felonies, according to the English law—was but an example of vulgar abuse.

The writer used to wonder at first why one of the men driven and harried and exasperated, did not, with good reason and in the name of ' better discipline ' and better manners, retaliate in an appropriate way. They are accustomed to it, we are told. They are too patient; and it is we not they who belong to the class that is, for all its advantages, the least self-controlled. That is but too obvious. To call a subordinate a ' swine ' or ' a son of a bitch ' or to think of one's subordinates in these terms, is apparently one of the characteristic results of a good ' Public School ' education. Good as it may be, it is not always entirely appreciated as such, in India or elsewhere.

The writer's great-grandfather, after swimming ashore with despatches and distinguishing himself again in another action—the battle of Camperdown—resigned his commission in the English Navy, leaving it on record that his reason for doing so was because in so many cases he had had to witness his brother officers goading the Lower Deck into sullen revolt, and then ordering them to be flogged for being mutinous. May it not be our provocative manners that makes Court Martial Law so necessary? There is so much talk that there has been change—the real fact is there has been far too little change.

At Sea, as in India, those in authority are, to a large extent, free from the criticism of Press and

Parliament and there are not many impartial civilian observers to watch ' authority ' on the rampage. The flogging of boys to drive them ' aloft ' and other pleasantries, would not be tolerated anywhere but at sea. No one denies that there used to be much bullying both at Osborne and Dartmouth and even at Greenwich. Apparently it is by no means entirely a thing of the past. The small boys at Osborne were made to ' sing ' with holly leaves in their mouths, presumably to harden their tongues as well as their hearts. This baptism of brutality, these petty cruelties, silly and grotesque, are quite unknown in French schools, where the smallest boys are on terms of perfect equality and friendliness with their bigger comrades.

The price of the manners we have learned in our Public Schools would appear to be a mutiny in India and a revolution at home. This seems rather a long price to pay for proficiency in offensive epithets, and the corresponding habits of thinking and behaving. The writer never remembers hearing any insulting epithets or witnessing any deliberate rudenesses until he went to a large school. To endure entirely unprovoked insults and brutality from those a little bigger than himself was, he was told, part of the training. The implications and reactions of such an experience must only too obviously be that strength, seniority or rank justify rudeness towards the subordinate and the weaker. This is apparently what so many Englishmen mean when they talk about ' discipline '. In order to distract attention from their own uncouthness, those in authority will usually denounce anyone who disapproves of these habits and manners as seditious or ‘ bolshevik ’. With so much to endure from his fellows it is not surprising that the average Englishman does not either look or feel particularly happy or good-tempered. We were apparently once a genial people, but no one can accuse us of that now; we are known on the Continent now as the ‘ uncongenial race ’.

Even if our government in India were juster and more sympathetic than it is, it would fail if we leave this blemish unattended to.

We have set up on our high places an image to be worshipped—a Public School image—a wooden-headed idol, unimaginative, class-conscious, intolerant and reckless. Puerility, so far from being looked upon as one of the failings of the half-developed man—temporarily atoned for by the beauty of youth and the irresponsible charm of the adolescent—has come to be looked upon in England as a sort of virtue! If we cannot change the character of our rulers in England, then we must change the rulers or they will more effectually destroy the Empire than all the real and imaginary Bolsheviks and Agitators in existence.

No wonder our Foreign Office is compelled to flounder amidst a welter of incompatible and irreconcilable political problems. We have cancelled more than half of the Italian debt, made Mussolini a Knight of the Bath, and have been compelled to condone or permit many things in Europe of which we strongly disapprove. Why? Because if we play the bully in Asia we must pay increasingly blackmail in Europe. Every discontent in India increases the military value of foreign submarines.

How can we possibly accept American proposals for a reduction in our fleet or in our armed forces when at any moment we may be hard put to it to suppress a ' mutiny ' in India and troubles with the native population in Egypt, Burma, China and elsewhere? While the domination-complex continues war will continue. We have got to cut away the roots of war!

§ 2

But it is still—and we hope it always will be—amongst the vast majority of the English people, an elementary duty to be chivalrous and even generous to a defeated foe—and even more imperative to treat with dignity and respect the lifeless remains of our fallen enemy. Even to the coffin of a felon, most working-class folk at least will lift their hats. Who are we that we should insult the dead? Yet, the English public woke up one morning to hear that by General Kitchener's express order the body of his opponent—the Mahdi, slain in battle—was to be treated with every indignity—lest, presumably, his memory should be held in reverence by the tribesmen whose leader he had been. It was ungenerous, impolitic, and a vindictive action.

The French declare that by the orders of the

British Commander, Joan of Arc was stripped and thrown naked to our soldiers—before being burnt alive at Rouen. Joan of Arc, who had defeated the English, must be a ' witch ', and the Mahdi, who had troubled us, a ' wicked Mohammedan fanatic '. We shut our eyes with shame to think how easily, after the lapse of six centuries, stupidity and brutality tend to repeat themselves.

Not long after our degrading treatment of the dead body of the Mahdi we read with horror and disgust in the South African newspapers that three or four Englishmen in a good position had disgustingly fouled the grave of President Kruger—another of our defeated enemies. It was only schoolboy ' mischief ', we were told—stupidity on the part of some of the—let us hope—more ill-mannered of our fire-eating classes! But would any ordinary schoolboy who hadn't been brutalized and who had not been brought up to think that because he belonged to a class of ' gentlemen ', therefore whatever he chose to do must be the correct thing—have ever dreamt of doing or dared to do anything of the kind? No drunken dock-side labourer from Bermondsey or rough from Portsea does that sort of thing. Patriotism! Even murderers' bodies and graves are not treated with deliberate insult.

We hope all these things are things of the past—but at fairly regular intervals this sort of thing is repeated—somewhere in the Empire—not by roughs but by members of the ' superior class '.

Apologists for Lord Kitchener's action argue that he was in this respect only doing what Nurse

Cavell has done since—he did but put zeal for patriotism in front of his principles—in old-fashioned language he put the Empire before God. It is an ironic comment on the career of this undoubtedly patriotic—and for a time—very able General, that his own mysterious and unverified death was believed by many, and perhaps still is believed by some, to have been not unwelcome at the time to the Government of his own country! There can hardly be any justification for this belief—yet the meeting of the Mahdi and the victor of Omdurman in the Shades with the victims of the Amritsar nightmare as an accusing chorus would provide a theme for a Greek tragedy.

But Lord Kitchener at Omdurman and the English General at Amritsar were in a different position from the unfortunate Nurse Cavell. As regular soldiers they knew all the conditions of the Geneva Convention—they were legally bound to spare the captive, and those who surrendered, care for the wounded and dying, and decently to bury the dead. Their marching orders contained injunctions concerning the strict neutrality of all those who work under the protection of the Red Cross. Possibly Nurse Cavell did not realize how binding were these conditions. At any rate, she put her patriotism before an obligation of honour, as so many patriots are wont to do. If in so doing she jeopardized the comfort and safety not only of all the doctors and nurses who were attending on the sick, but also indirectly of all the sick and wounded in all the theatres of war in this last great war and—worst of all—in any future campaign, she probably did not realize what a heavy price not only she herself, but all those others, might have to pay for her action. She risked her own life, but she risked also the very foundations on which mercy and protection for the wounded in war had been built, for her action cast doubt upon the honourable undertaking into which all who tend on the wounded in war must enter!

Whether it was not far too high a price and far too terrible a risk to run, those who decided to erect a statue to her memory, and in doing so implied her country's approval of her behaviour, must decide. This brave woman did, for patriotic reasons, what she was in honour bound not to do. Bargains made with dishonour are commonly bad bargains. The dying words of this heroic victim of her own false reasoning contain a reproof to all who may imagine otherwise. ' " Patriotism " is not enough! ' Yet we have many who still believe that patriotism justifies their doing what they otherwise declare to be mean, dishonourable and shameful things!

Somewhere it is written ' Thou shalt not limit the Lord thy God,' but so-called patriots almost invariably appear to suppose that the commandments of honour and mercy and forgiveness are qualified and conditioned by the temporary exigencies of the British Empire. If it were truly so—then so much the worse for the Empire. In such a case, ' God ' might have to bring about its disappearance—lest a once useful political system, a one-time good ' custom ', might corrupt the world.

CHAPTER NINE

THE PROHIBITIONISTS

THE English governing class, brought up on golf and cricket, taught to worship games and to think little of intellectual attainments, thinks and knows still less of psychology, which it believes to be a new-fangled invention of sentimental monomaniacs. This type—and it exists even in America—forget that all real improvement of character can only take place in an atmosphere of ‘ free choice ’ between two lines of action. That immediately you limit ‘ choice ’ you diminish the extent of any possible improvement, you merely leave a smaller field in which to develop better judgment or to learn less from less experience the evil results of your error. Excess of opium, tea, beer, tobacco, gambling, sloth or fornication brings educative reprisals to which Society, if left to itself, is very quick to respond. But when prohibition becomes absolute not only is nothing learnt from experience but a reaction takes place against all and every form of disapproval whether legal or social, whether political or domestic.

The only justification for any system of morals is that its practice definitely increases the happiness, contentment and peace of mind of the people concerned; if it does so, it thereby enlarges their opportunity of freedom, including the freedom to experiment in other directions or in any way that may develop their talents or their character.

If the result of prohibition and restriction and penal laws concerning opium, gambling, alcohol and private morals generally, is not only to diminish the sense of freedom and gaiety but also to increase deceit and evasion, suspicion and espionage, to multiply the opportunity for blackmail, to provoke discontent and hostility to all laws, and provide a temptation for hypocrisy, then that code of law and those restrictions are doing more harm than good and are obviously unsuitable for that stage of culture and those temperaments which have been subjected to it.

One would not have thought it necessary to labour the point that when laws are passed concerning individual behaviour by smug and well-to-do folk in Birmingham or Boston, they are likely to be unsuitable—almost unbearably so—for persons living in poorer and more confined circumstances or amidst quite different social surroundings, and all the more so when temperamentally and racially they are of different stock.

Moral prohibitions fairly easily obeyed—and still *more* easily evaded—in self-contained mansions and detached villas in Belgravia or Brighton can bear twice as harshly on the poor in the crowded streets of Bermondsey or Bombay, where evasion and seclusion are more difficult and where prohibitions do but create discontent, suggest deceit and give opportunity to the police for blackmail.

But give a prig power and he will make a desert of smouldering discontent and irritability and evasion and call it chastity—he will gradually destroy or circumvent all liberty and call it virtue—and then he will profess to be horrified when he is told that all the ‘ misunderstanding ’ is on his side.

Our problems in India are aggravated by the same fussy school-marm outlook that irritates us in England. It has been often said, and it is—in England—just as often forgotten, that there is no real freedom unless there is liberty to do what many other folk might never think of doing and what others might even regard with the most intense disapproval. Almost anything we may do, from sun-bathing to eating pork or snails, irritates and disgusts a number of other folk. The limitation of freedom is the limitation of virtue. Virtue does but consist of using, not the terrors of the Law, but our reason to restrain us from what we are free to do and might momentarily wish to do, but on second thoughts consider harmful or unwise. We Anglo-Saxons are always urging one another and our Government to prevent or to stop something or other, something which is being done quite voluntarily, without any special intent to harm and which does not appreciably harm any other person.

For example, it is alleged that there is misbehaviour in some of the great temples of India. Many of these temples are as large as a large village and have a correspondingly large population of priests, acolytes, pilgrims, servitors and miscellaneous folk employed in distributing the amulets, charms, relics and other things which are associated with ritualistic religions, or in providing refreshment for the half-famished pilgrims who flock to these great temples. Others are employed in the cleansing, actual and ceremonial, of the images, altars and spacious courts that resemble streets.

Miriam, we are told, danced before the ark of her Lord. If the great temples of India have Miriams whose lives are not in some cases above reproach, or if there be immorality of any sort amongst the motley crowds who throng these temples, it is, no doubt, regrettable—it is not to our liking. But we are told that we must deny the Indian self-government while this state of affairs persists! That it is our business to prevent what we disapprove of from happening in temples six thousand miles from our shores! We are reminded that money-changers and those who sold pigeons—presumably for sacrifice—had to be driven out of even the temples in Jerusalem by a Prophet whose murder was afterwards contrived, not by the displaced sellers of live-stock, but by the High Priests!

Certainly, having so completely sterilized our religion of any sex association, it shocks our English ideas that there should be any loose behaviour tolerated in a place intended for worship and contemplation. But when we turn our eyes nearer home, we are forced to admit that many of the ‘ marriages ’ that are so elaborately solemnized in Christian temples are, in reality, perilously near to prostitution. Even in Christian temples flirtation is not entirely unknown. It is scarce a generation ago that the Dean of St. Paul's had to complain in the

Press that the side aisles of the cathedral had been for years a recognized rendezvous of an undesirable kind.

If what was true in London in 1880 of a great Christian temple should be true—in more aggravated forms—in India in 1930 is not so very surprising. We cannot expect other countries to keep exact step with ourselves in their moral, social and economic evolution. European countries within a stone's throw of one another are quite often out of step with their nearest neighbour. There are European boundaries which represent, in many cases, a drop of some fifty to a hundred years in social progress. For European differences we have to make reasonable allowances, but we are never willing to make the much greater allowance which the climate and culture in India entitles the Indian to receive.

Even in a small country like England the different classes and individuals composing those classes do not always keep in exact step as regards their progress in social, political and intellectual evolution. Some day, perhaps, the human race will act and think with the instinctive spontaneity and monotonous regularity of a flight of wild geese, and then our rate of progress, if any progress *can* be made without the stimulating suggestiveness of contrasts, will not differ from that of any other nation or race. But until this happy state of affairs arrives it is entirely unreasonable for our Uniformalists to rebuke the Russians, the Chinese, the Indians and the Spaniards for not having identical codes of law and morals. Any sudden improvement or very rapid change in

Indian standards would, as likely as not, draw down upon them the sort of displeasure that fell upon the Russian nation when it suddenly resolved to give up the drinking of vodka, or the ridicule that was heaped upon the Chinese when they made bonfires of their opium pipes a few years ago.

CHAPTER TEN

REMEDIES AND REFLECTIONS

§ 1. *Remedies*

It is not helpful to criticize our manners or our administration in India without suggesting how matters might be improved.

From his work in India and Burma the writer learnt some at least of the grievances under which the Indian is smarting. Experience of the difficulties caused by our attitude to the Irish, travel in countries as different as Costa Rica and China, have confirmed his opinions concerning the stupidity of our attitude to the Indians. He believes that the following suggestions are not only feasible but, if carried out, would largely abate the demand for independence both in India and Burma, besides reducing the friction and hostility which at present exist between the white and brown races.

(*a*) *Every Englishman taking up any appointment should, before proceeding to India, have to pass a test showing that he had some elementary knowledge of Indian History and the two main Religions.*

It is possible to cut out from the curricula of the senior classes in our schools some subjects of less importance to the British Commonwealth, and insert books about Indian History and Religion. Fraser's *Literary History of India*, Noble's *Web of Indian Life*, and Lupton's *Happy India* are more suitable than the cynical and rather superficial ' Tales ' that are usually supposed to describe Indian Life.

(*b*) *The use of such terms as ' nigger ', ' seditious swine ' and all the other even more offensive terms both in English and Hindustani for Indians should be rigorously forbidden, either in speech or in writing, in public or in private—to insult Indians in India should be considered a serious matter. No Englishman dare insult Italians in Italy.*

Seniors—military, civil or commercial—should be held personally responsible for the strict observance of this prohibition, and must themselves set the example. It is already an offence in West Africa to speak of an African native as a ' nigger '. The tendency has even been to call all coloured people, including Arabs and Turks, ' niggers ', and lately even Italians and the Southern Irish.

The constant use of contemptuous terms, whether applied to a nation, a class, a profession or any other collection of men, soon produces a corresponding temper and outlook.

(*c*) *The punishment for ' striking an Indian ' must be approximated to the punishment inflicted in the Army for the serious but similar crime of ' striking a soldier '.* In both cases the individual struck is scarcely in a position to strike back.

In the nature of things the Indian is very rarely likely to give real provocation; and the law would deal with him if he did. Heavy fines, severe reprimands, and even, in aggravated cases, imprisonment or expulsion from India should be given for 'striking an Indian'. Severe punishment would be given in England to an Englishman who flew into a fury at Paddington and beat a railway porter who had made some stupid mistake—so why not in India?

The difficulty is that magistrates, senior policemen and judicial functionaries generally are the club-mates, play-mates and often the near relatives of the Englishman accused of aggression towards an Indian. It may be necessary to insist that judicial functionaries keep more aloof, in order to retain their impartiality—the Government should retain the power of increasing penalties.

(*d*) *The removal from India after a period of probation of Europeans temperamentally unsuited for work amongst strange or coloured races must be insisted on.*

Persons of neurotic and highly irritable dispositions, and those who develop neurasthenia owing to the irritating properties of tropical sunlight, should be sent home, as used to be done by the old East India Company.

The over-irritable Englishman, whether an official in Delhi or a business man in Calcutta, a nuisance anywhere, is a positive danger in our tropical dependencies. The Negro-phobe must go!

On the other hand, every encouragement should be given to those who, without loss of dignity, take an interest in, and get on well with, all classes of Indians. A sense of humour and an intelligent interest in perhaps the most interesting country and collection of races in the world is an absolute necessity for a useful and happy life in India.

(*e*) *Habeas Corpus and all that that charter of freedom implies must be enacted and respected in India.* We shall not beat the Indian by Indianizing our own sense of decency and justice, nor by degrading our legal and political machinery to the level of the trickery used by the Mogul invaders of India.

(*f*) *The Indian must be given every opportunity and encouragement to reconstitute again his communal society.* Not by a return to the almost defunct caste system, but by adopting other forms of Trade Unionism, Community, or Guild Associations.

Our abuse of the caste system in India has been overdone. It was far better than nothing at all; and probably has saved India many civil wars and social upheavals. It is difficult to explain our dislike of this system, when we have so much of something similar in England—it may be that it provided an awkward barrier to our exploitation of India in the eighteenth century. In any case it is crumbling now, and something must take its place—a chaotic India can only be a demoralized and defenceless one.

Indians should be encouraged in all manly exercises, and the Boy Scout movement should receive Government recognition.

(*g*) *The exportation of food-stuffs must be prohibited until the price of food has fallen so far that there is a danger of food being wasted.*

Even if food prices went back to the 1898 level the majority of Indians would on their present wages still be on or below the poverty-line. By any European standard they would be far below it and near the semi-starvation line. Nothing can justify the exportation of food-stuffs from India at present. It would be kinder to sanction a return to infanticide than to do anything to check a fall of prices in India. There is no reason why the Indian standard of living should be permanently any lower than the standard in Italy, Greece, or Spain.

(*h*) *Any Englishman wishing to remain in India should be obliged to pass a simple colloquial test in Hindustani, or the language of the Province he is to work in, after six months in India.*

Much might be done on the outward voyage to encourage the formation of an intellectual liaison. Lectures, films and books giving a sympathetic account of Indian Life, Art and Philosophy, and an account of the languages of India and the Indian's peculiar economic difficulties, would do a good deal to create that understanding and interest that is the necessary foundation for sympathy and good-will.

(*i*) *It should be impressed on all Englishmen proceeding to India or to any tropical possession—by Army Orders and Government Instructions if necessary—that we can only retain our Empire by so treating the inhabitants of its constituent parts that they do not WISH to leave us. We must begin to be more amiable.*

The idea that you can make or keep people ' loyal ' with either threats, blows, whips or machine-guns must be dropped once and for all. The only real cure for sedition is a just, tolerant and sympathetic rule, combined with the gentle art of ‘ leaving people alone ’; especially in all domestic and private concerns. Englishmen proceeding East must not be surprised to find that India is at present over-governed and under-fed.

(*j*) *Taxation must be reduced, and a much larger sum devoted to the services of Health and Education.*

This can only be done by very largely reducing the amount of money now expended on the British garrison and the Indian Army, and also on Secret Services, and extravagant building schemes such as the New Delhi—luxuries India cannot afford.

India is not only over-governed and under-fed, but also very much under-educated. She simply cannot afford the ever-increasing army of highly-paid English officials, because they will insist on having what are by Indian standards such colossal salaries and pensions, in fact actually larger than very much richer countries like the United States or England can afford to pay.

The iniquity of the scale of the salaries and pensions paid to all English officials, civil and military, by India is not fully realized; it is an unpopular subject to broach, for nearly all of us, including Members of Parliament, have relatives drawing salaries or pensions from the Indian taxpayers—the poorest aggregation of tax-payers in the world.

The question should not be how much we Englishmen expect, but how much India—for its size, one of the poorest collection of countries in the world—can afford to pay us. The injustice is double when it is remembered that a part of the pay and all of the pension—which is but deferred pay—will almost certainly be spent out of India!

France, proportionately far richer and more civilized than India, pays her Field-Marshals £750 a year! Compare this modest income with the pay demanded from the wretched Indians by many English police officers, civil servants and army officers, of whom there are so many who exact from India at least twice or three times the remuneration of a Field-Marshal of France!

The excuses made for this high scale are usually the climate or the cost of living. But if the modest pay of American officials working in the torrid heat and cramped surroundings of the Isthmus of Panama, and French officials in Africa and Asia, be compared with the pay drawn even by junior English officials in India, the disparity is almost as great.

As for the cost of living in India, it largely consists in keeping motor-cars and horses, and in playing polo and bridge, or indulging in entertainments, or shooting, and in fact living generally in a style and on a scale that no Englishman unless he were a rich man would attempt to do to-day in England. Naturally a life which is often an almost continuous round of sport and other amusements, and includes membership of one or more good clubs, and a trip home to England—a round journey of fourteen thousand miles—every two or three years, necessitates a large expenditure. But why should the Indian be forced to pay for a host of the most extravagantly paid and generously pensioned officials in the world, when he is already so poor? Nor does it make the burden any lighter when so many of these highly paid servants treat their paymasters with such scorn and contempt.

It is rather as if a farmer were forced to employ a retinue of gorgeous servants whose salaries were so high that the farmer and his children had to do without their dinner in order to pay them.

The writer, neither very senior nor one of the better-paid officials, received in England about eight times the pay of an English mechanic and four times the pay of a bank-clerk; but on proceeding to India he would receive about one hundred and twenty times the pay of an Indian mechanic and thirty times the pay of an Indian clerical worker. The disparity, too great in England where, at least, it is paid by consent, is far too great in India where it is forced from a poorer and defenceless population.

(*k*) *Missionary propaganda and exaggeration concerning the 'depravity' of Hindus and 'pagan immoralities' should be discontinued at public and preparatory schools in England.*

Sermons and lectures encouraging a pitying contempt and complacent sense of superiority, make neither for Unity, Peace or Concord, nor for Christianity. Nor is it fair to foist upon ignorant and destitute Indians with the aid of governmental subvention, and the bribe of free meals, institutions and doctrines that are no longer accepted fully in England. Bigotry should not be an article of export; yet we are exporting as ‘ Christianity ’ much of what is partly moribund or the subject of destructive criticism in Europe.

Europeans for ‘ religious ’ reasons burnt one another alive; this is as bad as throwing babies under Jugganaut’s car or giving them to crocodiles for ‘ religious ’ reasons—only there is no proof that the Hindus ever did either the one or the other!

Odium Theologium—a bad servant and a worse master—needs no official encouragement from the Government of India.

There is still much ‘ Church ’ talk in Europe about Indian idolatry; but the ‘ Church ’ ignores the fact that image-worship is reviving in England, and that the Roman Catholics have varied essentially or omitted the prohibition against bowing down to graven images contained in the Ten Commandments.

The impression made by missionaries who attempt to raise money for their expenses in India by lurid denunciations of Mohammedanism and Hinduism, has been deplorable—it has only stimulated race-hatred and mutual dislike.

(*l*) *The misguided efforts to increase personal contact in social matters between the average Hindu and the average Englishman in India should not be persisted in. Such social contact at present is more likely to produce mutual irritation and contempt than respect.*

Few Englishmen have sufficient knowledge of the origin of Indian customs and manners, or sufficient historical sense to know just what actions on the part of a Hindu are natural and meant as compliments, or the reverse.

For good or evil we English are on the average very bad *mixers*—particularly with strangers and strange races. It is no use disputing a fact so obvious to anyone who has watched Russians, Frenchmen and even Americans mixing with Arabs, Brazilians, Afghans and other non-European races. In the mass the Englishman does not always get on too well or for very long even with Americans, Canadians or Australians; so it is perfectly absurd to expect him to share willingly and cheerfully a railway carriage, a refreshment room, a bungalow, or the use of an office or a bath-room with Hindus. The attempt to force him to do so will only be disastrous.

The habits, philosophy, and ideas of sanitation of the Hindus, though defensible and perhaps in some cases as good or better than our own, are rather Babylonian than European; to be shut up in the same railway carriage on a long journey with human beings whose habits are so different from our own is simply purgatory—it is only stupid sentimentalism to pretend that it is pleasant or even endurable.

Three common instances in which this social incompatibility makes for serious friction will be sufficient.

On a long hot railway journey an Englishman will endeavour to cool himself by washing his face and hands or by bathing his neck. A Hindu, with Oriental wisdom, elects to cool himself by constantly rinsing out his mouth, washing his feet, or some other part of his body. But, alas, in the lavatory of the train there is only one basin! Result—extreme disgust on the part of the Englishman followed by abuse of his fellow-passenger—who may be a Hindu squire or nobleman—and in frequent cases even blows, and in any case mutual indignation and disgust, accompanied by furious demands to the guard in charge of the train ‘ to clear out this filthy nigger who is washing his feet in the basin in which I and my wife have got to wash our faces!’

Again, an Indian landowner or an Indian coolie will expectorate as freely and almost as recklessly in 1928 as a Canadian or American gentleman did in 1888, or as a London public-house loafer did in 1908. Progress in hygiene even in Europe is not uniform in the different countries, nor amongst the different classes even in the same country. This is a real difficulty in India, but it is folly to shut one’s eyes to an ever-present source of disgust and aversion.

Then, again, the table manners of a wealthy middle-class Hindu who has not been educated in Europe are to-day about as peculiar and as distressing as those of his late Majesty King George the Second, of which we have such lurid and disgusting accounts. What is the use then of advocating more social intercourse between Englishmen and Hindus?

Nor is the disgust all on one side. A strict Mohammedan or Hindu of good family would find the elated and somewhat vinous young English subaltern after a Guest-night much more disgusting than would his fellow-Englishmen.

Those who know India well could give many other examples of the incompatibility of the social customs of the two races, who must at present, for their own comfort and peace of mind, keep apart in social matters as much as possible. It is quite unfair to ask Englishmen to admit to their Clubs, their Messes, and their homes, Indian men and women. It is possible to be friendly and sympathetic without mixing intimately with a race whose habits are not European. After all, many Englishmen would not willingly share the same sleeping compartment or the same office with a representative of at least three of the European nations.

(*m*) *A tariff fixing the rates of payment for domestic work, porterage and similar services should be drawn up and made public in every large Indian town and military cantonment.*

It would obviate many quite serious disputes. Officers and other young Englishmen, and tourists, in sheer ignorance, sometimes over-pay Indian porters, servants, and others; much more often they seriously under-pay; and when the Indian disputes the amount he is beaten for being impudent!

The Sahib in India travels about very often with large quantities of heavy baggage, bedding, rifles, and all sorts of miscellaneous stores and equipment; yet too often the departing Sahib will, as the train leaves, fling out of the window a quite inadequate sum, to be scrambled for by the six sweating Indian porters who have transferred his baggage, perhaps at express speed, to enable him to make his connection. He does this because they are 'only natives'. This is dishonesty, and it destroys any trust or respect for the white man. The same man would not dare to do this sort of thing in England. This is the type of Englishman who decidedly would be better out of India.

(*n*) *More should be done by Universities and Public School authorities to combat the amazing ignorance in England concerning India and things Indian.*

In all public examinations there should be at least one question set on Indian subjects; passages to India for students and undergraduates and even for Members of Parliament might be granted at specially low rates.

There should be more discussions of Indian politics and social conditions. The newspapers in some cases give less space in 1928 to Indian news and views than they did in 1887. Useful comparisons could be drawn between the social and moral conditions of, say, Welsh or Suffolk villages and villages in Bengal or Rajputana, between the slums of Glasgow and of Bombay or Calcutta. We must try to get rid of some of the self-satisfaction of the young Englishman who arrives in India puffed up with smug prejudices and genteel intolerance for 'pagans and niggers' and all others who have not been brought up in an English suburb.

(*o*) *The police question must be tackled. Policemen in each Province should be not only natives of that Province* *but under provincial control; all attempts to militarize the police force and keep it in a state of latent hostility to the civil population should be dropped.*

The morale of the police force of course depends very largely on the officers. It is unfortunate that there is such a strong tendency for police officers, and for that matter for all the young Englishmen in India, to ape the style and attitude of ‘ the Military ’. The young officer of the British garrison and of the Indian Army has much to answer for in India as elsewhere. The fact is, the social prestige of the British Army officer is still high; and what the officer does to-day, will be done by the young Indian civilian, policeman or business man to-morrow.

(*p*) *The money-lender, be he Mahajan, Bunnia, Chetty, or Shroff, must have his wings severely clipped; it is as bad for him, as it is for the corrupt policeman, to imagine that he has behind him and his usury and blackmail the bayonets of the British Army.*

(*q*) *The question of over-population cannot be left to cure itself by means of famine, plague, tuberculosis, and semi-starvation. The encouragement of Birth-Control must be officially recognized.*

(*r*) *The Indian Penal Code should be humanized; apart from violence and fraud, the improvement in the moral outlook should be looked for less from police interference than from improved education, hygiene and housing.*

Even the best police force in the world is liable to behave tyrannically and foolishly when it is made a censor of sex-morals. If this is true in London, where public opinion is so powerful, it is certain to be much truer in India where the police are controlled by a Foreign Bureaucracy.

Possibly, probably even, the above suggestions will be declared to be impracticable or valueless by the India Office and the Powers-that-Be in India. If it was almost an impertinence for King George to make any suggestions, it must obviously be more so for any other Englishman, and particularly for one who has not even belonged to the Indian Civil Service.

But something to diminish racial tension must be done—things can hardly be left to become ripe again for the employment of machine-guns and aeroplane bombs. We shall only have further Amritsar massacres and similar incidents; and then a period of innocent surprise that after all this shooting and bombing the 'poor Indian' still does not love us any better! We shall have the Irish difficulty over again on a vaster scale, and probably with the same miserable and humiliating result.

In 1921 the Irish people were described as 'rebels led by a murder-gang'! They were referred to even in their own hearing as 'damned dagoes'. This sort of attitude and the Black and Tan police reprisals only involved us deeper and deeper in the mire; we have been travelling on a similar road to ruin, in India.

Undoubtedly the India Office has a difficulty, and will have more with a certain type of Englishman who holds office in India. This type is fairly numerous, and can suffocate with ill-concealed hostility almost any scheme of reform, especially one that diminishes its own power or prestige. In the past India has provided an ever-increasing number of pleasant and well-paid careers; and men naturally resent anything which reduces not only their own prestige and authority, but the number of official positions open for their sons in India. Many families have grown accustomed through generations to look to India for their son's future. Official India frankly admits that this is one of their principal objections to reforms in India; just as it would be, and in fact is, an objection to the Independence of Egypt.

Even if reforms be fathered by a Conservative Government, it is so easy to drop apparently unintentionally the wet blanket of disapproval on a new scheme; to let your subordinates see you are not anxious for new-fangled reforms to be a success or even workable.

The reactionary type in India is always in a majority; and in a very strong position, because, being the men on the spot, there is an outcry if they are overruled or superseded.

Indians can be persuaded to refuse to co-operate fairly easily. A reform intended for their benefit can be applied in an irritating manner. This sort of thing can only be met by very drastic and determined action both by the Indian Government and the India Office, who in turn require the backing of a House of Commons relentlessly determined to enforce its policy.

§ 2. *The Source of the Mischief?*

'India' epitomizes many of our troubles.

Our troubles increase because we have forgotten that there is all the difference in the world between *getting* and *governing*; between obtaining by courage, energy and initiative the mastery over a quarter of the human race in India, and retaining that leadership by patience, sympathy, sincerity, generosity, understanding, and imagination. These qualities are needed more and more as the memory of conquest becomes eclipsed by the complexity of growth and development. It is in these latter qualities that we English are deficient—and if Mr. H. G. Wells and other observers are to be believed, our deficiency has become much more marked since the stiff, self-conscious, and class-conscious Public-School type became so predominant.

We have been too much inclined to flatter ourselves that we are exceptionally successful in *governing* as well as in getting; that we rule all our subject-races and ourselves wisely and sympathetically. So we assume that any discontent or revolt against our rule is entirely unjustified.

This begs the whole question! It certainly is not the subject-races such as the Irish, Egyptians or Hindus, who reassure us as to our possession of sympathy, understanding and imagination; nor do they appear to be impressed with the sincerity and honesty of the policy of our Governments. True, Mr. Roosevelt assured us once that we were the 'Lord's anointed'; but then Mr. Roosevelt never had the advantage of being a coloured man governed by an Englishman in a tropical dependency, where an unfettered Press and Presidential Elections are equally unknown. It would be perhaps a characteristic American error to mistake success in 'getting' for the other kind of success that is measured by happiness and contentment.

Can we Englishmen affirm to-day that we really are such successful rulers as we like to proclaim?

Ireland? After seven hundred years of discontent, and a century of turmoil, hatred and revolt, the Irish have shaken themselves free from our rule. Ah! But the Irish are incorrigible.

Canada? Australia? South Africa? Almost before they are strong enough to stand alone, these colonies have demanded the parental latchkey!

And India? Within seventy years of the great Mutiny India struggles and cries out for Home Rule, if not for complete Independence.

Ceylon and Burma, after what is—comparatively speaking—a short experience of our governance, demand Home Rule. Even Malta and Jamaica appear to have found that the Englishman has lately become increasingly 'difficult'. And Egypt? After forty years of our occupation Egypt is more unappreciative of us than ever—still licking her wounds—still remembering the horror and flagrant injustice of Denshawai!

Already Arabia smoulders in revolt, and East

Africa grows restless. It is curious how unsuccessful our ‘ success ’ is beginning to look.

We cannot wonder at this; for we do not even govern ourselves in England without arousing resentment, hatred and threats; a general strike; much discontent and talk of Revolution. How many times have the English threatened or accomplished Revolution against their own Government? The writer is old enough to remember seeing a raging crowd of unemployed and discontented Englishmen tearing down the railings in Hyde Park and shattering the windows of Park Lane. Since that date many things have come to pass in England; but neither tranquillity nor contentment has been one of them.

But our troubles seem in particular to have multiplied recently.

It is but yesterday—about sixty years ago—that the Public-School cult began really to develop in England. It may have its good points, most things do; but it certainly results in a young Englishman learning to look down upon large numbers of his fellow-men. He begins by looking down upon his fellow-countrymen who have not been to the same grade or class of school as himself. Later he is looking down upon the working classes, ‘ tradespeople ’, the Latin races and other foreigners; and then he goes out East and finds it easy to look down on Indians and Chinese; who together represent nearly half the human race. So he learns to look down upon nearly everything and everybody.

It is childish to talk about ‘ agitators ’—the last bogey of the frightened, the incompetent and the obtuse. Can we put our finger on any one characteristic or habit of mind that will account for our increasing difficulties? Can there be any connection between this Public-School cult of class-conscious superiority, physical force, and arrogant self-esteem, and our troubles at home and abroad?

Physical force? Does anyone deny that the average English Public School-boy is trained with the connivance of his schoolmasters to admire physical force? Sadistic tendencies are stimulated and during puberty they lurk in unsuspected places. The consensus of opinion is certainly that flogging —which is but an unscientific form of torture—has evil results on all concerned.

One does not see this Public School notion concerning the inherent ‘ cheekiness ’ of small people—and of course of smaller nations—fitting in very well with the practice of arbitration, disarmament and equality inside the League of Nations—an institution curiously unpopular with the classes that have passed through the Public Schools.

The impulse to use physical violence—the firm hand—and the supposition that ‘ cheek ’ must necessarily be met by a thrashing, suggest both the primitive mind and a lack of self-control; neither of them qualifications for successful governance.

We shall be told that the Englishman would rather give up his Empire than his superiority-complex, and its supporter his Public School system. It may be that circumstances will be too strong for him, and that he will not even be given the opportunity of making his choice.

§ 3. *Our Stewardship—has it been Just?*

Let the Englishman who considers criticism of our Government of India uncalled for look back on the long period we have been in control, and on our actions both before and after the widespread mutiny against our rule in 1857.

We entered India as adventurers. It was not the best Englishmen who went out to India in the early days—rather the contrary. Naturally it was the more desperate ne'er-do-wells—those who could not make good in England, whose own country was too hot to hold them—that were driven to adventure in such a far-off and unhealthy country. Many of them were evidently the sort who would boast that for them at least, and particularly East of Suez, 'there were no Ten Commandments'. It was they who were the pioneers, and who made such unscrupulous haste to get rich before drink, sunstroke, cholera or some other deadly disease carried them off. It was these 'Nabobs'—whose vices and cruelty made them hated even in England, where they bribed their way into Parliament, or built with ill-gotten gains their Georgian mansions—who began the exploitation of the more or less helpless Indian. It was they who fomented the jealousy and quarrels between neighbouring States to their own profit in India; as in more recent times Englishmen are accused and actually boast of having done in Europe.

In any case on our own admissions we ruthlessly 'shook the Pagoda tree'; exploiting the rich but loosely-governed Indian States, weakened and disorganized by their jealous quarrels, as European countries are from time to time. We raided and plundered, settled and intrigued on the rich coasts of India, much as our Danish ancestors had raided the 'Saxon Shores' and the coast of East Anglia. Vast fortunes were brought back to England from India by unknown adventurers, some of whom had been scarcely ten years absent—and few questions were asked!

So we sucked India dry; until English observers compared the country to a 'squeezed lemon'. Accounts written by Englishmen of the state of India after the first hundred years of English rule and English interference make ghastly reading. If the Irish are to be believed, we did something of the same sort on a smaller scale in Ireland; and it is said we never hate anyone so much as those we have injured.

How much then of the present poverty, degradation and ignorance in India, at which we now turn up our noses, is not directly or indirectly due to our past behaviour? Certainly our fiscal methods must have helped to impoverish the soil; just as our missionary propaganda and economic pressure hastened the break-up of the old Indian social system, which, in the opinion of many, was one of the most stable and generally beneficial systems of village-communities in the world. We undermined this system, and the disarmed and submissive Indian, not being free to develop his own defensive mechanism against social chaos, has put nothing in its place; and we, because we feel we deserve his resentment, because we fear for our own safety, desire no substitute.

It may not be entirely our fault that India, who has by no means recovered yet from the greed and misgovernment of our eighteenth-century ' Nabobs ', and whose population is still uneducated, has little else to look forward to now but a new ' Khali Yog '—a Black and Bitter Age of Industrial Exploitation; an era of strife and competition and underpaid labour in a tropical climate, without any really powerful organization to mitigate that frightful menace.

Are we going to permit this bleak future to materialize?

We can only prevent the disaster of an unmitigated industrialism that would enslave and still further enfeeble the populations of India, if we work sympathetically with Indians as equals; if we cease to think and talk of them as ' niggers ' or inferior folk; if we give up preaching at them, patronizing and bullying them, because, being unarmed, they can neither answer us back nor throw us out.

This is not mere sentimentalism; we must prevent further exploitation for our own sake, otherwise conditions in India, both physical and moral, will become a danger to the world—a veritable witches' cauldron, whose fumes and emanations of misery and Anarchism would poison Asia. Tuberculosis and plague are rampant in India, and many other diseases are increasing in virulence because they are being 'passaged' through a huge underfed and ill-conditioned population. Already the problem confronts us!

We have with our commercial policy, and in the pride of our religious intolerance and misunderstanding, deliberately broken down the Brahminical Caste system, that might have provided a bulwark in India against social chaos and ruthless industrial exploitation. What are we going to provide instead? It may not be possible for us to do more now than to give the Indian an opportunity of meeting the danger with his own methods. As in other countries, racial instinct may suggest some revival, some organization or system which for want of a better name may have to be called Gandhism or Indian-Communism.

We shall have to encourage the Indians to unite again, to have their Trade-Unions, Patriotic Leagues, Boy Scouts, Swadeshi Associations, Tariffs and all the other defensive devices we ourselves are employing in Europe against unfair competition, unlimited greed, ruthless exploitation and decayed morale. To say we dare not do so yet because 'the Indian hates us so' is our own condemnation.

* * * * *

One hears the ice clinking in the glasses that are being brought by still obsequious native servants, and one hears, too, the rustling of the withered palm leaves stirred by the scorching winds from the Rajputana desert. There are whining beggars that stand like living skeletons with hands outstretched in the heat and glare outside your bungalow telling you of the famine in Gujurat or in Sind. Out on the horizon is one of the four hundred thousand crumbling mud-walled blank-eyed Indian villages that are the real India; where the sweating Indian, his wife and children, slave seven days a week for twelve or fourteen hours a day, in those diminutive arid pathetic little plots they call their fields. And it is he and his like, who live in those mounds of hovels, who pay for your servants and the refreshment you are taking; for the shady bungalow in which you sit at your ease; your first-class passage home to England and the comfortable pension—a fabulous sum to him—you are leaving India to enjoy!

And we English have owned this 'Glorious Empire' in which there is so much misery and abject poverty for nearly two hundred years! When shall we begin to cultivate our Garden?

THE END

INDEX

Adolescence, 187
Afghanistan, 7
Afghans, 41, 115, 139
'Agents-provocateurs', 37, 41, 131, 200
Alligator, 111
Americans, 164, 227, 230
Amritsar, 2, 4, 151, 163, 243, 265
Andaman Islands, 151
Anglicanism, 95
Arabs, 41, 149, 153, 218, 268
Arms, Carrying of, 107 ff.
Army, Indian, 11, 114

'Babus', 29
Benares, 157
Bengal, 151, 196, 218
Bengalis, 34, 71, 144
Birth control, 13, 93, 113, 120, 122, 264
'Black and Tans', 218, 265
Boers, 153, 224
Bolsheviks, 155, 205, 221
Bombay, 73, 246, 263
Boston, 106
Boy-Scout movement, 254, 274
Brahmin priest, 62, 78
Brahminist religion, 42, 95 ff., 116
Brazil, 8
Brothels, 86 ff., 94
Buddhist religion, 42
'Budnam', 39
Burma, 41, 69, 218, 268

Calcutta, 46, 70, 263
Caste, 43, 254, 274
Cattle, 102
Cavell, Nurse, 243
'Cheek', 51, 64
China, 8, 41, 192
Chinese, 164, 249
Chirol, Sir Valentine, 4
Christianity, 161
Civil Service, Indian, 22, 112, 265
Climate, Indian, 23, 86, 91 ff.
'Club', The Indian, 3, 27, 32, 46, 124, 128 ff.
Communists, 172
Consent, Age of, 120 ff.
Cork, 2
Cotton mills, Indian, 215
Covenant of the League of Nations, 52
Crawling Order, 4, 163
Curzon, Lord, 35, 74, 130

Daily News, The, 69
Degeneracy, 137 ff., 150 ff., 258
Delhi, 32, 256
Denshawai, 65, 268
Devadasis, 15

Dominion Home Rule, 14
Dress, Indian, 192
Drink, 124, 163, 205

East Africa, 218, 219, 220, 268
East India Company, 30, 115
Egyptians, 41, 66, 73, 218, 266, 267
Emigration, 120, 122
Employment in India, 27, 75, 211
Eton, 52, 175, 185, 224
Exhibitionism, 187

Famine, 119, 209 ff.
Freeman, The, 69
Frontiers, Indian, 114

Gandhi, 47, 130, 219
Ganges, ' Mother ', 151
Garrison Clubs, 3
George V, King, 9, 265
Germans, 152
Good-bye to All That, 174
Gourkhas, 69, 114
Grain, export of, 208 ff., 254
Graves, Robert, 174
Great War, The, 230
Greeks, 104

Habeas Corpus, 39, 224, 254
Harrow, 52, 53
Hindu, 20, 33, 37 ff., 42, 44, 73, 76, 95 ff., 102 ff., 130, 216, 259 ff., 267
Hinduism, 157, 160
Hindustani, 255
Home Rule, 14, 21, 67, 115, 268
Hong Kong, 218
House of Commons, 3, 14, 17, 40, 52, 156, 178, 266

Ignorance, 263
India, Government of, 17 ff., 30, 36, 43
India Office, the, 266
India, United States of, 6
Indian Civil Service, *see* Civil Service, Indian
Indian dress, 192
Indian Mutiny, 4, 115, 191, 271
Indian States, Native, 36
Indian women, 99 ff.
Industrialization, 212
Infanticide, 119
Ireland, 6, 8, 43, 67, 69, 136, 268, 272
Irish, the, 22, 215, 216, 265, 267
Irish ' Rebellion ', 15, 52

Jains, 42
Japan, 7, 41
Jew, 44

Karachi, 208
Karpore, 53
Kipling, Rudyard, 32, 98, 150, 184, 223 ff.
Kitchener, General, 241
Kruger, President, 242

Labour Government, 40
League of Nations, The, 7, 129, 178, 227
Literary History of India, The, 251
London, 104, 106

Magna Carta, 39
Mahdi, The, 241
Malaria, 119, 138, 148, 206
Manchester Guardian, The, 69
Mandates, 228
Marriage, Age of, 120
Mayo, Miss K., 8 ff., 18, 105, 137 ff., 150 ff., 159
Milton, 223
Missionaries, 258
Mohammedans, 37, 42, 130
Money-lenders, 264
Mosaic Laws, 103
Mother India, 11 ff., 90 ff., 105 ff.
Mussolini, 240

Nationalism, Indian, 20
Native Army, 35
Native States, 36
'Negro-phobes', 32, 253
New York, 157
Noble, Miss, 161, 251

Opium, 205
Opium Treaty, 224
Osborne, 239
Oxford, 183

Palestine, 44, 218
Parsees, 42
Pathans, 34, 114, 144, 153
Payment for service, 262
Peacocks, Temple, 53
Penal Code, Indian, 39, 193 ff., 264
Pensioners, 222
Pensions, 215, 256
Persia, 7
Pig-sticking, 113
Plague, 112, 119, 264, 274
Podanur, 4
Police, English, 195, 199
Police, Indian, 25 ff., 35 ff., 94, 121, 194 ff., 216 ff., 263 ff.
Polyandry, 119
Polygamy, 121, 123
Population, Indian, 112, 118 ff.
Poverty, Indian, 13 ff., 88 ff., 104, 134, 211 ff.
Press, the, 24 ff., 228 ff.
Prohibitions, 246
Prostitution, 94, 102, 103 ff., 127
Public Schools, 6, 19, 34, 46, 48, 50 ff., 64, 71, 98, 142, 166 ff., 232, 267, 269
Punitive police, 40, 216 ff.
Puritans, 157, 162

'Quai Hais', 47

Racial pride, 223
Railways, Indian, 210
Rangoon, 32
Religions, Indian, 42, 95 ff., 102 ff., 157, 251

Roman Catholicism, 95
Roosevelt, Theodore, 267
Russians, 41, 164, 249

Sandhurst, 176
Sanitary laws, 194
Service Clubs, 32
Sex, problems of, 8 ff., 90 ff., 121, 133 ff.
Shanghai, 32, 192
Shooting game, 61, 109, 118
Siam, 7
Sikh policemen, 218
Sikhs, 42, 69
Simla, 36, 208
Simon Commission, 5
Singapore, 218
Slaves of the Gods, The, 11 ff.
South African War, 15, 52, 105, 153, 220, 224
South American States, 8
Submarine, 221
Suttee, 101
Swaraj, *see* Home Rule

Taxation, 214, 256
Temple maidens, 14, 248
Terror, effects of, 138, 146, 153, 186
Trade, Indian, 30
Tuberculosis, 120
Turkey, 139

United States of America, 11
United States of India, 6

Venereal disease, 86, 104, 120, 140, 150
Vishnu, 62

Water-carriers, 212
Web of Indian Life, The, 161, 251
Wells, H. G., 267
West African negro, 29
Widows, Remarriage of Hindu, 99 ff.
Wolverhampton, 213
Women, Indian, 99 ff., 103 ff.
Women in India, white, 125

DS480 .45.07
Must England lose India? : The Nemesis
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00135 2006